

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

---

No. CCXXII.]

JUNE, 1863.

[VOL. XIX.]

---

## PRINCIPLES OF THE POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY.\*

THE idea of law, scarcely recognized in the infancy of mankind, has finally established itself, at least for all the phenomena of external nature, in the thought of our modern world. To the eye of the untaught savage, the physical changes taking place around him seemed to depend upon no infallible guidance; and the rain and the thunder, the sunshine and the cloud, were thought to come and go according to the capricious passions of malignant or kindly powers. The progress of the inductive philosophy, however, has brought within the domain of human knowledge those natural events which, even to so wise a thinker as Socrates, seemed to lie beyond the power of calculation; and if prayers are still sometimes offered for seasonable weather, and much remains to be learned before the coming storm can be predicted with unfailing accuracy, no one doubts that the uncertainty of the event is the result of human ignorance, and not of any defect in the divine order which holds the world together. Nor is it any more believed that life and thought, society and civilization, are exempt from the dominion of law. There is a growing disposition among thoughtful men to suppose that on the stage of history, too, events are transacted not capriciously, nor as the accidental desires or fears of individual men may dictate, but with regularity and in sequences which adequate knowledge might predict. And thus science tends to include human affairs also in its ever-widening sweep.

The eloquent author of that splendid fragment intended to form an introduction to the "History of Civilization in England," startled the literary world by the uncompromising manner in which he carried the idea of Law into the province of history, and endeavoured to shew that the rules according to which human actions take place are quite as rigid as those which bid the sun rise in the east and spring succeed to winter. Such a work, had it been completed, being chiefly "positive" in its aim, and touching little on metaphysical questions except for the purpose of setting them aside, would probably have left the mind as little

---

\* An Inquiry into the Theories of History, with special reference to the Principles of the Positive Philosophy. London—W. H. Allen and Co., 13, Waterloo Place. 1862.

satisfied as the fragment itself. Mr. Buckle was indeed very unjustly suspected of having meant more than he said, and there was no just ground for believing that his strenuous assertion of law was intended to be exclusive of anything higher. A disciple of the positive philosophy on its affirmative side, he did not follow it in its denials, nor attempt to determine whether the law whose claims he pleaded was final or only the expression of a Supreme Will. This question therefore remained, and the work before us may be considered as an answer to it. It is not to be expected that this work, though written in direct advocacy of a religious view of human history, will be read with the same avidity as the *History of Civilization*. For one thing, it wants the attraction of novelty. The writer does not possess the great command of language or the vigour and eloquence of style for which Mr. Buckle was remarkable; he wants—what, however, is no defect—his overwhelming self-assertion; he does not overflow with the same generous enthusiasm. He deals, moreover, almost wholly in abstractions, of which the English mind is ever impatient. We do not, however, intend to institute any comparison or contrast. Such a comparison is hardly fair, considering the difference of subject, and has been suggested more by the title of the work under review than by the work itself. The title, “*Theories of History*,” is somewhat misleading. The author does not concern himself in any special degree with history. He does not carry us either up or down the course of events, in order to find their source in a Divine Benevolence or their issue in an ultimate perfection. He does not mark the footsteps of a divine purpose in the great transactions which constitute epochs in human affairs, nor does he seek to reconcile the miseries which have pursued the human race through every change of affairs with belief in a Providence. He does not attempt to resolve those questions which are naturally suggested by the recognition of law as presiding over the actions of men, such as the freedom of the will and the responsibility of man. The object of the work is to shew that the presence of law throughout the universe is not exclusive of God, as M. Comte contended; that, on the contrary, law implies a Lawgiver; and that the efficient cause of things is not entirely beyond the reach of human knowledge. It might therefore have been more fitly entitled simply “*Theism*.”

The author treats first of the “*Theory of Chance*,” which supposes that events take place without any necessary interdependence, so that any event might have been different from what it was, its antecedents remaining the same, or might have produced different consequences from the actual ones. And here we must observe that the instances given of modern believers in this absurd theory do not seem to us to be very well substantiated. Mr. Grote is first arraigned, because, in reference to an attempt to persuade Darius to invade Greece at a time when Athens was



wholly unprepared to resist, he remarks upon the consequences which would have followed had this attempt been successful. "Thus Mr. Grote," says our author, "even while recognizing history as a sequence of causes and effects, considers that, in order to afford applicable knowledge, it requires us to study not merely real events, but also imminent contingencies which were on the point of occurring, but yet did not occur; that is, according to the interpretation of the theory of Chance, probabilities, possibilities, chances." Surely, we reply, the historian is not to be shut out from the great realm of the *might have been*. If Darius, in the case referred to, had asked, as he probably did, what would be the consequence of an invasion of Greece just at that time, would he have been justly convicted of believing in chance? Or does it make such an important difference whether the event is yet in the future or already past, although, according to the theory of law, it is in either case equally fixed? It is allowable, we maintain, to detach any single event from the series in which it occurs, to supply its place by a different one, and then ask what would be the result. And so far is such a practice from implying a belief in chance, that it rests altogether on a belief in law, without which it would be impossible to reason from a supposed event to its certain consequences.

In the similar charge against M. Comte, there is, we think, also a fallacy. M. Comte has found fault with the solar system, and thinks that the organization of animals might have been better. Upon this, our author observes that "under the rule of Chance there is no security for the best arrangement of the elements of the solar system or for the best organization of animal bodies, and a better arrangement or organization than the actual one is not only possible but probable, since the actual arrangement or organization is only one of an indefinite number of chances. On the contrary, under a system of positive law and order such as M. Comte maintains, just as much as under a system of divine law and order, which he denies, antecedents and consequents must be conceived to be intimately connected and the mutual relations of things and events well defined and perfect for their ends." Now we do not see why a self-existent law and order should be perfect. The imperfections which the French philosopher thought he could detect in the universe, granting their existence, may be as easily conceived to be the inevitable consequences of their antecedents as the most perfect possible results. A divine law may be a security for perfection, but a self-existent law is not; and the supposed imperfection was one ground on which the denial of a Supreme Mind was based. It was very foolish of M. Comte to suppose that he could improve upon the universe as it is; but we see no inconsistency between this supposition and the maintenance of inviolable law; nor can we think the charge has been established that "in his anxiety to

escape from the Scylla of Theism, he has fallen into the Charybdis of Chance."

But we must not dwell longer upon these points, which after all are only incidental to the main question. We follow our author into his discussion upon the theory of law, observing with him that while law is entirely exclusive of chance, it may be regarded either as ultimate and therefore exclusive of God, which is the positive view, or as the expression of a Divine Will, which is the doctrine of Theism. Our author is quite as strenuous an advocate of law as Mr. Buckle or M. Comte himself, and carries the idea with firm consistency into the realm of mind and into the relations which man sustains with the Divine Being. It is not necessary for us to analyze the argument in which he has unfolded this theory, but one or two extracts will shew the spirit in which the subject is treated. The following remarks upon prayer strike us as very admirable and just :

"Prayer is distinguishable from worship inasmuch as it presents the devotee in the attitude of a petitioner, a solicitor of some real or supposed, present or future, personal or relative, material or spiritual benefit. It seems to be included in the meaning of a petition that it brings a request to the notice of him to whom it is addressed ; that it may be either conceded or refused ; and that the considerations it suggests may contribute to its success. Hence the minuteness, the repetition, and the urgency in liturgical services. Hence the popular conception that God hears some prayers and does not hear others ; grants some petitions and denies others. And hence the common saying in certain religious circles that sincere prayer *moves the hand that moves the world*.\* This shows that prayer is generally supposed to work an effect upon the divine mind which would not otherwise be produced, and that in fact the petitioner believes that he sways God to his own purposes and employs Him as an instrument for their accomplishment. This in conception at least takes the government of the world out of the hands of God, places it in the hands of man, and throws us back into all the vicissitudes of uncertain human volitions, into confusion, chaos and chance. It is not enough to say that such a notion of prayer leads to atheism : it is practical atheism under a religious guise. The mere statement of it is sufficient to establish its fallacy. Is there, then, no moral significance or power in prayer ? There are both the one and the other. The meaning of prayer is that we are subject beings, living in daily, hourly, momentary dependence upon God, and amenable to the laws which are the expressions to us of his nature and will ; the moral efficacy of prayer is that it recognizes that dependence, and that this recognition helps to bring our minds

---

\* "M. Dupanloup, the present Bishop of Orleans, and the most illustrious among his episcopal brethren, has expressed the opinion, quoted by M. Montalembert in his work on the *Monks of the West* (I. 44), that 'prayer equals and surpasses sometimes the power of God. It triumphs over His will, His wrath, and even over His justice ;' and Mr. Ruskin (*Modern Painters*, IV. 87) describes the only conception of God which for us can be true as that of 'a being to be walked with and reasoned with ; to be moved by our entreaties, angered by our rebellion, alienated by our coldness, pleased by our love, and glorified by our labour.'"



into a state of cheerful acquiescence in the will of God and of intelligent obedience to His laws. The effect of prayer is not upon God but upon ourselves. It does not inform Him of wants of which he would else remain ignorant. It does not dispose Him to grant favours that would otherwise be withheld. It does not incite Him to action when he would otherwise be quiescent. Even the effect upon ourselves is not directly contemplated, for if it were, this would transform prayer to a mere moral mechanism in no degree superior to the wheels of the Tibetan Buddhists and to the rosaries of Romish Christians by which prayers are numbered and valued. Prayer, divested of all formulistic notions and mechanical appliances, is the natural and spontaneous effusion from the depths of the human heart of its earnest aspirations after a deeper insight into Divine law, a nearer moral assimilation to the divine image, a more intimate communion with the divine spirit of all truth and of all good. Whenever from the inmost recesses of the soul we ask for that which is conformable to the laws of the divine government, the moral disposition from which such a prayer proceeds is itself by anticipation and by confirmation its all-sufficient answer. He that asketh receiveth: he that seeketh findeth. The answer to prayer is thus not the contravention but the fulfilment of law. All prayers to turn back the laws of the universe for our benefit, all prayers to draw forth the thunderbolts of the Almighty against our enemies or against the enemies of our creed or of our country, all prayers thanking the merciful ruler of all for the success of crime, injustice, and oppression, are solemn mockeries and daring impieties which offend and alienate the genuine spirit of religion."

In a similar spirit the conception of revelation is brought into agreement with the notion of law:

"The primary conception of Revelation itself," continues our author, "may seem to furnish an argument for chance and against law. The accepted sense of divine revelation is a culmination of the popular notion of a divine providence. Revelation is a divine interference in human affairs on a grand scale out of the ordinary course of human events and above the ordinary operation of causes and effects; and the object is the communication of important truths for the present guidance and the future salvation of mankind. Such an extraordinary interposition is inconsistent with law and is naturally resolved into chance. The supposition is that law is transcended by the author of law; that in the divine mind there is a change from one purpose to another; that at one period God governs the world by ordinary means and at another finds it requisite to carry out his designs by extraordinary expedients—a supposition which overthrows law from its very foundation and plunges the world into the vortex of chance. How can such a change take place in the Immutable Being? If it does, what becomes of the permanence of law? And if there is no permanent law, how can we escape from the fearful alternative of chance? The answer is, that the fundamental conception of revelation is complicated and corrupted by the forced union with it of foreign and incompatible notions. Assuming that there is a God—which in this argument the believer in chance does, in order to disprove it—the mere idea of such a being in our minds is a Revelation of Himself to us. Whatever the modes in which it has been reached, and whatever the imperfections which must always cling to it in our

minds, the fact is not altered that the possession of the idea is a substantive Divine Revelation. . . . The same may be affirmed of every other true idea; for instance, the idea of right or intellectual truth and the idea of duty or moral obligation. These, too, are Revelations, that is, manifestations of divine truth to the human mind. There is nothing here inconsistent with law, for each truth is supposed to have been attained under the established operation of divine law, in the natural use of the human faculties, and in the ordinary progress of human society. Let us now suppose that, according to the eternal prevision of the Omniscient Mind, the time has arrived when some new and great, important and necessary truth, additional to those already possessed by mankind, is to penetrate individual minds, permeate society, mould character, and purify, stimulate, and exalt human motives and aspirations, where is the need for assuming that in the mode of communication law will be superseded, contravened, and abolished? Such an assumption is contradicted *a priori* by reason which teaches us to expect uniformity, and *a posteriori* by experience which exhibits uniformity. It is therefore wholly gratuitous, unless it can be established by direct, positive, and overwhelming evidence; and in that case it is, as has been shewn, self-destructive, invalidating the essential truth on which it rests, the being of a God, and confirming the fundamental error to which it is opposed, the doctrine of chance. We may not be always able to trace the ways of God, but in seeking to comprehend them we should beware of ascribing to Him, even by the remotest implication, the change of his own purposes or the violation of his own laws. The fact of the supposed Revelation, its moral value, and its salutary effects may be undisputed and indisputable, and yet the mode of its communication may be in perfect consonance with fixed and invariable law. The operation of that law may be complex, mysterious, and even seemingly exceptional, but if there is a God we cannot do other than conceive of Him as always the same and everywhere consistent with Himself."

Law, then, prevails everywhere. But the question still remains, "Is law the highest conception of the human mind, the sole bond of the universe, the ultimate source to which its phenomena can be traced? Or, Is there a higher conception, an ulterior source, an intelligent will, presiding over the universe and expressing itself by law?" This question is most ably discussed, with special reference to the positive philosophy and to the doctrines of Mr. J. S. Mill. M. Comte's division of human history into three stages—the theological, the metaphysical and the positive—is sufficiently known. Through these three stages he traced the birth, the development and the decline of the idea of God. Taking fetichism for its earliest form, the belief in a superhuman will next passed into polytheism, and finally arrived at the highest or monotheistic stage. Metaphysics, substituting abstract ideas for concrete personalities, formed a transition step to what M. Comte supposed to be the consummation and last result of human development; and the positive era, in which theology and metaphysics make way for the study of phenomena and their laws, is that towards which the world is now rapidly



hastening. Forgetting that true ideas may have a history as well as false ones, and that it may not be without labour and length of time and much battling with error that truth is at length attained, M. Comte thinks that by discerning the origin of the idea of God he has demonstrated its falsehood. How inconclusive is such an argument it is hardly necessary to point out. Had he indeed demonstrated that that idea had run its course and would never more bear sway in the world, a reasonable doubt might be raised as to its substantial truth, since truth, though hard to find, cannot perish when once discovered, but must endure as long as there are minds to receive it. But to discover the origin of an idea is not to prove its falsehood, unless it can be shewn to have sprung from accidental circumstances and to be based upon no unchangeable principles. Nor is it sufficient to prove that it has been connected with errors, or that it has passed through a variety of stages before attaining its most perfect form, since this has been the case with every truth. The idea of law, which M. Comte defends, has had its origin and history as well as the idea of God, which he rejects. It has been of slow growth, and has not gained its place in human thought except after the lapse of ages and many vicissitudes of fortune. It is not indeed arbitrary nor accidental. It is based upon facts, and is firmly rooted in the constitution of things and in the nature of the human mind. But neither is the idea of God arbitrary or accidental. It also is bound up in the very nature of man, and rests upon principles which cannot be shaken. It has, no doubt, taken the form of erroneous systems and lamentable superstitions, but the errors with which it was mixed must not be confounded with the essential truth which underlay them. The sense of a Divine Power, the belief in the presence of a Divine Will, is the one truth which is to be found in fetichism and polytheism as well as monotheism, and the deepest researches of philosophy confirm the truth, and sanction the claim of the human mind to penetrate beneath the outward show in which the senses are doomed to live and find the One Divine Cause of all things.

We cannot follow our author into the farther discussion of this important and interesting subject. It must suffice to say that he has handled the "theory of will," or of law as expressive of will, and considered the various objections to a Primary Cause, to a Providence and to Final Causes, with an ability and clearness, with a candour and moderation, which do equal honour to his head and his heart. We conclude with an expression of our opinion that he has taken the right and only tenable point of view for the defence of Theism—law *exclusive* of chance, law *expressive* of God—and with a hearty recommendation of the work to our readers.

## LORD CHATHAM ON MORALS AND RELIGION.

WILLIAM PITT, the first Earl of Chatham, is one of that not inconsiderable number of distinguished men who have been careful to distinguish religion from superstition, and who, while upholding pure morals and defending rational religion, have raised their voice clearly and earnestly against spiritual despotism and the other arts of priestcraft.

Lord Chatham, though not without serious faults, was by common consent an eminently great man. Let our recent historians pronounce their opinions on him :

"With all his faults and affectations," said Lord Macaulay, "Pitt had in a very extraordinary degree many of the elements of greatness. He had splendid talents, strong passions, quick sensibility, and vehement enthusiasm for the grand and beautiful. . . . He often went wrong—very wrong. But, to quote the language of Wordsworth,

'He still retained  
Mid such abasement, what he had received  
From nature, an intense and glowing mind.'

"History owes to him this attestation, that, at a time when every thing short of direct embezzlement of the public money was considered as quite fair in public men, he shewed the most scrupulous disinterestedness,—that, at a time when it seemed to be generally taken for granted that Government could be upheld only by the basest and most immoral acts, he appealed to the better and nobler parts of human nature,—that he made a brave and splendid attempt to do by means of public opinion, what no other statesman of his day thought it possible to do except by means of corruption,—that he looked for support, not, like the Pelhams, to a strong aristocratic connection, not, like Bute, to the personal favour of the Sovereign, but to the middle class of Englishmen,—that he inspired that class with a firm confidence in his integrity and ability,—that, backed by them, he forced an unwilling court and an unwilling oligarchy to admit him to an ample share of power,—and that he used his power in such a manner as clearly proved him to have sought it, not for the sake of profit or patronage, but from a wish to establish for himself a great and durable reputation by means of eminent services rendered to the State." (Critical and Historical Essays, II. 149, 150.)

The same distinguished writer closes another essay on Lord Chatham by declaring that "History deliberately pronounces that among the eminent men whose bones lie near his, scarcely one has left a more stainless, and none a more splendid, name."

Mr. Massey says of him :

"William Pitt was a genius for brilliant achievements, for extraordinary emergencies, for the salvation of a country. As a statesman, Pitt can endure comparison with the greatest names of modern history—with Ximenes or Sully, Richelieu or De Witt. As an orator, he is yet unrivalled; and to find his equal, we must ascend to the great masters of antiquity." (History of England, I. 7.)



The same historian states that his death alone prevented his return to power, and that his resumption of office would have been immediately followed by the pacification of America, by the prevention of the French war. England would then, he conjectures, have been spared the addition of one hundred millions to the national debt, and might possibly have averted the convulsion which a few years later produced another and still more ruinous war.

Still higher is the tribute which Lord Stanhope pays him :

“ But that which gave the brightest lustre, not only to the eloquence of Chatham, but to his character, was his loftiness and nobleness of soul. If ever there has lived a man in modern times to whom the praise of a Roman spirit might be truly applied, that man beyond all doubt was William Pitt. He loved power, but only as a patriot should,—because he knew and felt his own energies, and felt also that his country needed them,—because he saw the public spirit languishing and the national glory declined,—because his whole heart was burning to revive the one and to wreath fresh laurels round the other. He loved fame, but it was the fame that follows, not the fame that is run after,—not the fame that is gained by elbowing and thrusting, and all the little arts that bring forward little men,—but the fame that a Minister at length will and must wring from the very people whose prejudices he despises, and whose passions he controls. The ends to which he employed both his power and his fame will best shew his object in obtaining them. Bred amidst too frequent examples of corruption; entering public life at a low tone of public morals; standing between the mock Patriots and the sneerers at patriotism, between Bolingbroke and Walpole, he manifested the most scrupulous disinterestedness and the most lofty and generous purposes; he shunned the taint himself and in time removed it from his country. He taught British statesmen to look again for their support to their own force of character, instead of Court cabals or Parliamentary corruption. He told his fellow-citizens, not as agitators tell them that they were wretched and oppressed, but that they were the first nation in the world; and under his guidance they became so.” (*History of England*, III. 21, 22.)

Except his speeches, little remains by which posterity may form a judgment respecting his intellectual powers. Early in the present century, Lord Grenville published a small collection of Lord Chatham's Letters to his nephew (afterwards Lord Camelford). He thought their publication would “ promote the inseparable interests of learning, virtue and religion.” Lord Chatham's aim in corresponding with his nephew was to teach him, “ by the cultivation of his reason, to strengthen and establish in his heart those principles of moral rectitude which were congenial to it; and, above all, exhorting him to regulate the whole conduct of his life by the predominant influence of gratitude and obedience to God, as the only sure groundwork of every human duty.”

That Lord Grenville did not form an undue estimate of the wholesome religious influence with which the Earl of Chatham sought to inspire the mind of his nephew, let the admirable

advice that follows shew; it is taken from the fourth letter (dated from Bath, Jan. 14, 1754).

“I highly recommend the end and intent of Pythagoras’s injunction; which is to dedicate the first parts of life more to hear and learn, in order to collect materials out of which to form opinions founded on proper lights, and well-examined sound principles, than to be presuming, prompt, and flippant in hazarding one’s own slight crude notions of things; and thereby exposing the nakedness and emptiness of the mind, like a house opened to company before it is fitted either with necessities, or any ornaments for their reception and entertainment. And not only will this disgrace follow from such temerity and presumption, but a more serious danger is sure to ensue, that is, the embracing errors for truths, prejudices for principles; and when that is once done (no matter how vainly and weakly), the adhering perhaps to false and dangerous notions, only because one has declared for them, and submitting, for life, the understanding and conscience to a yoke of base and servile prejudices, vainly taken up and obstinately retained. This will never be your danger; but I thought it not amiss to offer these reflections to your thoughts. As to your manner of behaving towards these unhappy young gentlemen you describe, let it be manly and easy; decline their parties with civility; retort their raillery with raillery, always tempered with good breeding: if they banter your regularity, order, decency, and love of study, banter in return their neglect of them; and venture to own frankly, that you came to Cambridge to learn what you can, not to follow what they are pleased to call pleasure. In short, let your external behaviour to them be as full of politeness and ease as your inward estimation of them is full of pity, mixed with contempt. I come now to the part of the advice I have to offer to you, which most nearly concerns your welfare, and upon which every good and honourable purpose of your life will assuredly turn; I mean the keeping up in your heart the true sentiments of religion. If you are not right towards God, you can never be so towards man: the noblest sentiment of the human breast is here brought to the test. Is gratitude in the number of a man’s virtues? if it be, the highest benefactor demands the warmest returns of gratitude, love, and praise: *Ingratum qui dixerit, omnia dixit*. If a man wants this virtue where there are infinite obligations to excite and quicken it, he will be likely to want all others towards his fellow-creatures, whose utmost gifts are poor compared to those he daily receives at the hands of his never-failing Almighty Friend. Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth, is big with the deepest wisdom: The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and, an upright heart, that is understanding. This is externally true, whether the wits and rakes of Cambridge allow it or not: nay, I must add of this religious wisdom, Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace, whatever your young gentlemen of pleasure think of a — and a bottle, a tainted health and battered constitution. Hold fast therefore by this sheet-anchor of happiness, Religion; you will often want it in the times of most danger; the storms and tempests of life. Cherish true religion as precious as you will fly with abhorrence and contempt superstition and enthusiasm. The first is the perfection and glory of the human nature; the two last the deprivation and disgrace of it. Remember the essence of religion is, a heart



void of offence towards God and man; not subtle speculative opinions, but an active vital principle of faith. The words of a heathen were so fine that I must give them to you: *Compositum Jus, Fasque Animi, Sanctosque Recessus Mentis, et incoctum generoso Pectus Honesto.*

"Go on, my dear child, in the admirable dispositions you have towards all that is right and good, and make yourself the love and admiration of the world! I have neither paper nor words to tell you how tenderly,  
"I am yours."

There is another address on a religious subject attributed to Lord Chatham which is not referred to by Lord Grenville, nor is it noticed in the sketch of Lord Chatham in Mr. Park's edition of Walpole's "*Royal and Noble Authors.*" It has, however, been several times printed, sometimes with this heading: "*Letter on Superstition, addressed to the People of England by the Right Hon. William Pitt, afterwards Earl of Chatham;*" at another time with the heading, "*On True and False Religion,*" or "*Christianity defined.*" The letter is not unworthy of the distinguished man to whom it is attributed. In the character of both the thoughts and style there are internal evidences of its being authentic. It is stated that it "*appeared originally in the London Journal, 1733.*" The earliest edition we have seen of this letter is supposed to be about thirty years after this. We have sought in vain, in the libraries to which we have access, for the means of verifying this statement. If the date be correctly given, it may appear a most remarkable circumstance that such a letter should proceed from the pen of a young man only twenty-five years of age, who was then a cornet in a horse regiment. But the improbability is lessened, if it do not altogether disappear, when it is remembered that the mind of the supposed writer was from an early period sobered by frequently recurring and severe attacks of illness. From sixteen years of age he was a martyr to the gout. Lord Chesterfield, referring to this fact, says that he acquired "*a great fund of premature and useful knowledge.*" He also bears this important testimony to his purity of character: "*His private life was stained by no vice, nor sullied by any meanness.*" Lord Stanhope has beautifully observed:

"Even the gout, that hereditary foe, which so grievously marred and depressed the energies of Chatham in his later life, may probably have quickened them in his earlier. In fact, it will be found that illness, with all its pains and privations, has both enjoyments and advantages unknown to stronger health. Who that has for weeks together been bound to the narrow and stifling confinement of a sick room, can forget the rapture with which he first again stepped forth to inhale the balmy breath of summer, and beheld the whole expanse of an azure sky? Thus also the distemper of Chatham, while it shut out the usual dissipations of youth, either allowed or enforced the leisure for patient study, and might induce him to exclaim, *Such are the compensations afforded in the all-wise scheme of Providence.*"

Having offered some reasons for accepting the letter as authen-

tic, we give it to our readers as a composition well deserving their attention:

"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." James i. 27.

"Whoever takes a view of the world will find that what the greatest part of mankind have agreed to call religion has been only some outward exercise esteemed efficient to work a reconciliation with God. It has moved them to build temples, slay victims, offer up sacrifices, to fast and feast, to petition and thank, to laugh and cry, to sing and sigh by turns; but it has not yet been found sufficient to induce them to break off an amour, to make restitution of ill-gotten wealth, or to bring the passions and appetites to reasonable subjection. Differ as much as they may in opinion concerning what they ought to believe, or after what manner they are to serve God, as they call it, yet they all agree in gratifying their appetites. The same passion reigns eternally in all countries and in all ages; Jew and Mahomedan, the Christian and the Pagan, the Tartar and the Indian, all kinds of men, who differ in almost every thing else, universally agree with regard to their passions. If there be any difference among them, it is this, that the more superstitious, they are always the more vicious; and the more they believe, the less they practise. This is a melancholy consideration to a good mind; it is a most terrible truth; and certainly, above all things, worth our while to inquire into.

"We will therefore probe the wound, and search it to the bottom; we will lay the axe to the root of the tree, and shew you the true reason why men go on sinning and repenting, repenting and sinning again, through the whole course of their lives; and the reason is, because they have been taught, most wickedly taught, that religion and virtue are two things absolutely distinct; that the deficiency of the one might be supplied by the sufficiency of the other; and that what you want in virtue you must make up in religion.

"But this religion, so dishonourable to God and so pernicious to men, is worse than atheism; for atheism, though it takes away one great motive to support virtue in distress, yet it furnishes no man with arguments to be vicious; but superstition, or what the world means by religion, is the greatest possible encouragement to vice, by setting up something as religion which shall atone and commute for the want of virtue.

"This is establishing iniquity by a law—the highest law; by authority, the highest authority—that of God himself.

"We complain of the vices of the world, and of the wickedness of men, without searching into the true cause. It is not because they are wicked by nature, for that is both false and impious; but because, to serve the purposes of their pretended soul-savers, they have been carefully taught that they are wicked by nature and cannot help continuing so.

"It would have been impossible for men to have been both religious and vicious, had religion been made to consist wherein alone it does consist; and had they been always taught that true religion is the practice of virtue, in obedience to the will of God, who presides over all things, and will finally make every man happy who does his duty.



"This single opinion in religion, that things are so well made by the Deity that virtue is its own reward, and that happiness will ever arise from acting according to the reason of things, or that God, ever wise and good, will provide some extraordinary happiness for those who suffer for virtue's sake, is enough to support a man under all difficulties, to keep him steady to his duty, and to enable him to stand as firm as a rock amidst all the charms of pleasure, profit and honour.

"But this religion of reason, which all men are capable of, has been neglected and condemned, and another set up, the natural consequences of which have puzzled men's understandings and debauched their morals more than all the lewd poets and atheistical philosophers that ever infested the world; for instead of being taught that religion consists in action or obedience to the eternal moral law of God, we have been most gravely and venerably told that it consists in the belief of certain opinions which we could form no ideas of, or which were contrary to the clear perceptions of our minds, or which had no tendency to make us either wiser or better, or, which is much worse, had a manifest tendency to make us wicked and immoral.

"And this belief, this impious belief, arising from imposition on one side, and from want of examination on the other, has been called by the sacred name of religion; whereas real, genuine religion consists in knowledge and obedience.

"We know there is a God, and we know his will, which is, that we should do all the good we can; and we are assured, from his perfections, that we shall find our own good in so doing.

"And what would we have more? Are we, after so much inquiry, and in an age full of liberty, children still? And cannot we be quiet unless we have holy romances, sacred fables and traditionary tales, to amuse us in an idle hour, and give rest to our souls when our follies and vices will not suffer us to rest?

"You have been *taught*, indeed, that right belief, or orthodoxy, will, like charity, cover a multitude of sins; but be not deceived; belief of, or mere assent to, the truth of propositions upon evidence, is not a virtue, nor unbelief a vice.

"*Faith is not a voluntary act.* It does not depend upon the will. Every one must believe or disbelieve, whether he will or not, according as evidence appears to him.

"If, therefore, men, however dignified or distinguished, command us to believe, they are guilty of the highest folly and absurdity, because it is out of our power; but if they command us to believe, and annex rewards to belief and severe penalties to unbelief, then are they the most wicked and immoral, because they annex rewards and punishments to what is involuntary, and therefore neither rewardable nor punishable.

"It appears, then, very plainly unreasonable and unjust to command us to believe any doctrine, good or bad, wise or unwise; but when men command us to believe opinions which have not only no tendency to promote virtue, but which are allowed to commute or atone for the want of it, then are they arrived at the utmost reach of impiety; then is their iniquity full; then have they finished the misery and completed the destruction of poor mortal men.

"By betraying the interest of virtue they have undermined and sapped the foundation of all human happiness; and how treacherously

and dreadfully have they betrayed it! A gift well applied; the chattering of some unintelligible sounds called creeds, and unfeigned assent and consent to whatever the church enjoins; religious worships and consecrated feasts; repenting on a death-bed; pardons rightly sued out, and absolutions authoritatively given,—have done more towards making and continuing men vicious than all their natural passions and infidelity put together; for infidelity can only take away the supernatural rewards of virtue; but these superstitious opinions and practices have not only turned the scene and made men lose sight of the natural rewards of virtue, but have induced them to think that, were there no hereafter, vice would be preferable to virtue, and that they still increase in happiness as they increase in wickedness; and this they have been taught in several religious discourses and sermons delivered by men whose orthodoxy was never doubted; particularly by a late reverend prelate—I mean Bishop Atterbury, in his sermon on these words, ‘If in this life only be hope, then we are of all men most miserable,’—where vice and faith ride most lovingly and triumphantly together.

“But these doctrines of the natural excellency of vice, the efficacy of a right belief, the dignity of atonements and propitiations, have, besides depriving us of the native beauty and charms of honesty, and thus cruelly stabbing virtue to the heart, raised and diffused among men a certain unnatural passion which we shall call religious hatred; a hatred constant, deep-rooted and immortal. All other passions rise and fall, die and revive again; but this of religious and pious hatred rises and grows every day stronger upon the mind as we grow more religious; because we hate for God’s sake, for our soul’s sake, and for the sake of those poor souls too who have the misfortune not to believe as we do.

“And can we, in so good a cause, hate too much? The more thoroughly we hate, the better we are; and the more mischief we do to the bodies and estates of those infidels and heretics, the more do we shew our love to God. This is religious zeal, and this has been called divinity; but remember that the only true divinity is humanity.

“W. PITT.”

It would not be easy to pen a description of practical religion more adverse to the orthodox faith than this letter. The writer spurns the idea of faith being either the path to heaven or being superior to good works; of innate human corruption; of any artificial atonement for sin; and of the unamiable feelings which grow out of the *odium theologicum*.

The letter might be improved by the addition of a passage or two illustrating the coincidence of the religion of the gospel with that religion of moral obedience and of love which the writer sets above mere forms of faith. But there is nothing in the letter itself inconsistent with a rational faith in Christianity. Bishop Tomline, in his *Life of Mr. Pitt*, mentions that Lord Chatham seldom allowed a day to pass (his health permitting) without giving instruction to his children, and of which the reading a chapter of the Bible always formed a part. The three divines whose works Lord Chatham loved to read, were Dr. Isaac Barrow, Rev. John Abernethy, of Dublin, and Rev. Zachary



Mudge. In the works of the first he admired the richness of the vocabulary, the exhaustive treatment of the subject, and the practical morality. Both Abernethy and Mudge were by education Presbyterians, and Abernethy remained a Nonconformist to the close of life. His Discourses on the Being and Attributes of God were warmly commended by Archbishop Herring, one of the latitudinarian divines of the Church of England.

It is to be regretted that the speeches of Lord Chatham which have been reported at length, are confined to political and party topics. The few passages on other subjects which have been saved from oblivion are of a kind to enhance our regret that speeches containing such brilliant gems have not been handed down entire.

Lord Chatham was the recognized parliamentary advocate of the Dissenters.\* He took part in the debates in the years 1772 and 1773, on the proposed repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. In the Parliamentary History this is all we find with respect to the earlier occasion :

“On the debate in the Lords on the Bill for the relief of Protestant Dissenters, May 19, 1772, the Bill was read a second time. The motion for committing the Bill was supported by Lords Chatham and Lyttelton, the Duke of Richmond and Earl of Shelburne, and opposed by Lord Bruce, Earl Gower, the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Peterborough, Llandaff, Oxford and London.

“The Earl of Chatham spoke very warmly and spiritedly in favour of the Bill, which he attempted to recommend and defend on the general principles of a liberal toleration. His Lordship shewed as much oratory and fire as perhaps he ever did in his life. In replying to one of the Bishops who had spoken a great deal of the dogmas of foreign colleges, he said there was a college of much greater antiquity, as well as veracity, which he was surprised he never heard so much as mentioned by any of his lordship’s fraternity, and that was the college of the poor, humble, despised fishermen, who pressed hard upon no man’s conscience, yet supported the doctrine of Christianity both by their lives and conversations superior to all. But, my Lords, probably I may affront your rank or learning by applying to such simple, antiquated authorities; for, I must confess, there is a wide difference between the Bishops of those times and the present.” (Parliamentary History of England, Vol. XVII. 440, 441.)

Lord Stanhope censures this speech as characterized by the “worst rant of the Dissenters.” It may seem to Lord Stanhope strange and coarse to hint that the right reverend fathers who sit in lawn sleeves in the House of Peers and mingle in political struggles and intrigues, are less to be admired than Paul and John and Peter; but the idea has probably not seldom occurred even to the minds of Churchmen. That it had strongly impressed

---

\* Mr. Burke, the authority for this statement, added that this portion of his mantle had, on his decease, fallen on the Earl of Shelburne.

itself on the mind of Lord Chatham is evidenced by its re-appearing in his next speech on the same subject. Our knowledge of this second speech is chiefly derived from a reference made to it, seventeen years after, by another orator whose reputation for eloquence rivals that of Chatham.

In the House of Commons' debate on the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, March 2, 1790, Mr. Burke spoke of Lord Chatham as a "man of brilliant talents and acknowledged abilities, a minister who had directed the government of this country with great glory to its national character and great safety to the constitution both in Church and State," and he then proceeded in these words:

"In the debate occasioned in the House of Lords by the second application, Dr. Drummond, the Archbishop of York, having called the Dissenting ministers 'men of close ambition,' Lord Chatham said 'that this was judging uncharitably, and that whoever brought such a charge against them defamed them.' Here he paused, and then went on: 'The Dissenting ministers are represented as men of close ambition. They are so, my Lords; and their ambition is to keep close to the college of fishermen, not of cardinals; and to the doctrine of inspired apostles, not to the degrees of interested and aspiring Bishops. They contend for a spiritual creed and spiritual worship. We have a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy.'" (Parliamentary History, Vol. XXVIII. 433.)

Mr. Gladstone has pronounced the closing words just quoted "a shallow witticism little worthy of so illustrious a man." But in truth there is in this epigrammatic sentence a deep meaning. The fact that one part of the Book of Common Prayer conflicts with another part, and that the clergy often dissent from the ideas involved in both, is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the Church's plea for uniformity, in virtue of which she demands clerical subscription. A body of men compelled to practise a mental reservation or to subscribe in a non-natural sense, are not entitled to criticise and censure those who at least attest their sincerity by a costly nonconformity. The saying of Lord Chatham may not now exactly describe the theological status of the English clergy; but, however modified, it will still indicate the incongruities that lurk in the Established Church. Some of the clergy may have infused a larger portion of the theology of Calvin into their faith, while others may have receded further than their predecessors from the spirit of Protestantism; but though the style of the pattern is somewhat different, the squares of black may have here and there trenched on the red, still the robe of the Church is as chequered as it was in the days of Chatham, and in its spirit his description is equally true and epigrammatic.



## NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Exodus xxii. 7—9: "If a man shall deliver unto his neighbour money or stuff to keep, and it be stolen out of the man's house; if the thief be found, let him restore double. If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought unto God, as to whether he have put his hand unto his neighbour's goods. For everything missing, for ox, for ass, for sheep, for raiment, for every lost thing which another saith was there, the cause of both parties shall come before God; and whom God shall condemn, he shall pay double unto his neighbour."

The meaning of bringing a cause in dispute before God was, that it should be determined by drawing lots, or, as we now say, by chance. So thoroughly did the Jews believe in the watchful providence of God, that they did not believe anything happened by chance, and thought that in this way they should obtain a righteous decision when they knew of no human means of otherwise determining it. Our translators, however, thinking more of our modern plan of cross-examining the witnesses, have rendered it, "shall be brought unto the judges." In Acts i. we see how one out of two disciples was chosen by chance to fill the place of the twelfth apostle, after a prayer to God that he would guide the fall of the lot according to his good pleasure.

---

Genesis xxxiii. 20: "And he erected there an altar, and called it El, the God of Israel."

Gen. xlv. 3: "And he said, I am El, the God of thy father."

In these and some few other passages in which the word Elohim and the word El both occur, it is as well to leave one of them untranslated, and thus shew the name by which the Almighty was called, as it would seem, in the northern tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh before the time of Solomon. The name of Jah or Jehovah seems at first to have been peculiar to the southern tribes of Benjamin and Judah.

---

Exodus xvii. 16: "For he said, Because the hand upon the throne of Jah will have war for Jehovah with Amalek from generation to generation."

King David, and each successor for the time being on the throne of Jerusalem, is here called "the hand upon the throne of Jah." And hence we see the probable reason why Eli-akim on coming to the throne changed his name to Jehoi-akim.

---

Exodus xxx. 13—15: "An half shekel shall be the heave-offering to Jehovah. . . . The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, than half a shekel, when ye give an heave-offering unto Jehovah."

In this very important passage our translators have omitted to tell us that this poll-tax, raised for the service of the temple,

was the heave-offering: they tell us simply that it was an offering, and thus fail to shew us that the command is more modern than that given in chap. xxv., where the heave-offering was ordered to be wholly a free-will gift. It would seem as if the plan of a voluntary and uncertain contribution had failed, and hence the priests had recourse to a poll-tax. When the temple was first built by Solomon, it was furnished by the help of forced labour; and it can only have been much later, after the priesthood had lost the support of the civil power, that they called upon their followers for voluntary contributions, and again, after the voluntary contributions had failed, that they proposed to levy a poll-tax. These interesting inquiries are closed against the reader who is not aware that the poll-tax of half a shekel was the heave-offering.

---

Leviticus i. 2: "If any man of you bring a gift, or *corban*, unto Jehovah."

This interesting word *corban*, the name for the free-will offering to the temple, is peculiar to Leviticus, Numbers, Ezekiel and Nehemiah, and it marks a very late date for those two books of the Pentateuch. When the heave-offering, which in Exodus xxv. 2, had been a free-will gift, was afterwards, as mentioned in Exodus xxx. 13, changed into the forced levy of a poll-tax of half a shekel a man, there naturally came into use a new name for the free-will gift, namely, *corban*. The poll-tax for the service of the temple seems to have been first levied in the reign of Joash, about B.C. 850. See 2 Chron. xxiv. 9. Hence the first and oldest half of the book of Leviticus may reasonably be supposed to be more modern than that reign. In the Authorized Version, this gift as well as the heave-offering of Exodus xxv. and xxx. are both called by the general name of an offering.

---

Leviticus ii. 4: "And if thou bring a gift of a meal-offering baked in the oven, it shall be unleavened pricked cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil."

It is interesting to remark that our bakers at the present day make use of the same plan of pricking a number of small holes in their biscuits which are made without leaven, in order to make them less heavy. We now use milk or butter where the Jews in Judea used oil; and our so-called captains' biscuits, when made with milk, and our butter-biscuits, are both counterparts of the above-mentioned unleavened cakes; while the Passover cakes of the Jews, which are still common in our bakers' shops, are the unleavened wafers which are too thin to need pricking. The Authorized Version does not tell us that our custom of pricking holes in the biscuits is three thousand years old.

S. S.



## THE PENTATEUCH.\*

ONE result of Bishop Colenso's bold criticism on the Pentateuch has been to make us rub our eyes and recal what we had really known or believed before, respecting its constitution and probable authorship. We owe to him the republication of two of the books cited below, and perhaps the production of the other, though there is no allusion in it to recent controversies beyond the significant quotation of the phrase *free handling*.

Theologians of the present day still remember perfectly well the appearance of Milman's *History of the Jews*, among the early volumes of "Murray's Family Library" (in the year 1829),—with what interest and delight it was hailed by the few liberal scholars and by general readers of that day; with what horror it was regarded by the unscholarly but orthodox many; how Tory clergymen and squires who had read with due edification the *Life of Napoleon* in Vols. I. and II., that of *Alexander* in Vol. III., and the *Lives of British Painters, Sculptors and Architects* in Vol. IV., hastened to purge themselves of all responsibility for an intelligible and reasonable *History of the Jews* by throwing Vols. V., VI. and VII. on the hands of their booksellers, with due indignation against the author (not a Dean then), against Murray and against the local vendors. But the book raised no public outcry; the Ecclesiastical Courts were not invoked to criticise it. The orthodoxy of that day was better pleased to pass such things by as quietly as might be. The less said about such books the better, was the principle acted upon. The book, published anonymously, though its authorship was perfectly well known, was quietly *ignored*, and was to be extinguished if possible. To this day it has only passed through a second edition. It is well that at this day, when books that serve to raise rather than satisfy scriptural questions pass through ten editions in as many months, this book, the careful study of which might have spared half our recent theological conflicts, should appear in an enlarged edition. The additions, it seems, are chiefly confined to the latter part of the book, and therefore do not invalidate the above estimate as to the value of the earlier portions to which we confine our present article. Nothing, we venture to think, has been since written more free-minded at once and truly reverential on the subject of the early Jewish history than these words of the original Preface, which most accurately describe the mode in which that author treated the history at every step:

---

\* Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part I. Abraham to Samuel. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Regius Prof., &c. 1863.

Milman's *History of the Jews*. Third Edition, enlarged. 1863.

The Pentateuch and its Relation to the Jewish and Christian Dispensations. By Andrews Norton, late Professor of Sacred History, Harvard, Mass. Edited by John James Tayler, B.A. 1863.

"Nothing (he says) is more curious or more calculated to confirm the veracity of the Old-Testament history, than the remarkable picture which it presents of the gradual development of human society; the ancestors of the Jews, and the Jews themselves, pass through every stage of comparative civilization. The Almighty Ruler of the world, who had chosen them as conservators of the knowledge of his Unity and Providence, and of his slowly brightening promises of Redemption, perpetually interferes so as to keep alive the remembrance of these great truths, the object of their selection from mankind; and which nothing less, it should seem, could have preserved through so many ages. In other respects, the chosen people appear to have been left to themselves to pass through the ordinary stages of the social state; and to that social state their habits, opinions and even their religious notions were in some degree accommodated. God who, in his later revelation, appeals to the reason and heart, addressed a more carnal and superstitious people chiefly through their imagination and their senses. The Jews were, in fact, more or less barbarians, alternately retrograding and improving, up to the 'fulness of time,' when Christianity, the religion of civilized and enlightened man, was to reveal in all its perfection the nature of the beneficent Creator, and the offer of immortality through the redemption of our blessed Saviour. To trace this gradual progress was the design of our earlier history; and according to this view, on the one hand the objections of Volney and those who consider the Books of Moses as a later composition, on the other those of Bayle and Voltaire against the Patriarchs and their descendants, fall to the ground at once. The seeming authorization of fierce and sanguinary acts, which frequently occur in the Hebrew annals, resolves itself into no more than this—that the Deity did not yet think it time to correct the savage, I will add unchristian, spirit inseparable from that period of the social state. In fact, in our reverence for 'the Bible,' we are apt to throw back the full light of Christianity on the Older Volume; but we should ever remember, that the best and wisest of the Jews were not Christians—they had a shadow, but only a shadow, of good things to come. In some places an awful reverence for that Being whom 'no man hath seen at any time,' induces the author to attach a figurative or allegorical, rather than a literal sense to the words of the Old Testament."

These clear and brave words, which so long ago discriminated between the human and the divine elements of the Old-Testament history, and prepared the reader to trace the progress of revealed religion amid the otherwise ordinary course of secular civilization, are the key-note to Milman's History of the Jews, and, we believe, to all rational criticism upon the Pentateuch. In the same Preface (it is prefixed to the *third* volume), he vindicates himself from the charge of not having sufficiently regarded the *inspiration of the word of God*. With Warburton, he deprecates that "spurious notion" which made the writers passive instruments. He hints pretty broadly that inspiration is "limited to doctrinal points;" a view which "if correct would obviate many difficulties." He maintains the personal wisdom of Moses as a civic legislator; and he concludes his Preface by saying:



"In the works of writers hostile to Revelation, the author has seen many objections embarrassing to those who take up a narrow system of interpreting the Hebrew writings; to those who adopt a more rational latitude of exposition, none.

We do not, of course, in our high estimate of the critical value of Milman's book, mean to imply that it has settled all the difficulties that arise in the study of the Pentateuch. It does not even discuss the question of authorship; but it leaves room for any theory that regards the Pentateuch as essentially historical in its main contents, however composite in its structure, however modified by successive editors. The value of Milman's book is found in the vivid reality which it imparts to the Jewish history, by translating it, as it were, from the accustomed phrases around which the haze of spurious devotion has gathered, into the fresh language of a modern writer of ancient history. Not even Dr. Stanley (of whose book we shall presently speak more at large), with the advantage of personal acquaintance with the whole scenery of Palestine, with his great pictorial faculty of reproducing the scenes and incidents narrated, and his rich store of parallels from ancient secular history, leaves a more decided impression of the reality of the Hebrew story. Indeed, the brevity and simplicity of Milman's renderings have the advantage on the whole.

Dean Milman gives in a Preface to the new edition of more than thirty pages a series of deeply interesting remarks, in which he briefly defends the principles on which his History is constructed, and states his views on some of the questions growing out of Jewish history and the Bible records which are now attracting so large a share of attention. The prefatory remarks are, he says, written with reluctance and from an imperious sense of duty. He avows his desire of peace, and in order both to it and to the preservation of faith he counsels moderation. Would that his words of wisdom could reach the minds of any considerable portion of our countrymen!

"If on such subjects some solid ground be not found on which highly educated, reflective, reading, reasoning men may find firm footing, I can foresee nothing but a wide, a widening, I fear an irreparable breach between the thought and the religion of England. A comprehensive, all-embracing, truly Catholic Christianity, which knows what is essential to religion, what is temporary and extraneous to it, may defy the world. Obstinate adherence to things antiquated, and irreconcilable with advancing knowledge and thought, may repel, and for ever, how many I know not, how far, I know still less. Avertat omen Deus!"—P. xxxiv.

On the subject of the general treatment of Jewish history by Christian writers, and in reply to the question whether the Old Scriptures are, like other historical documents, to be submitted to criticism as to their age, their authenticity, their authorship,

and above all their sense and interpretation, the Dean offers these weighty observations :

"But though the Jewish people are especially called the people of God, though their polity is grounded on their religion, though God be held the author of their theocracy, as well as its conservator and administrator, yet the Jewish nation is one of the families of mankind; their history is part of the world's history; the functions which they have performed in the progress of human development and civilization are so important, so enduring; the veracity of their history has been made so entirely to depend on the rank which they are entitled to hold in the social scale of mankind; their barbarism has been so fiercely and contemptuously exaggerated, their premature wisdom and humanity so contemptuously depreciated or denied; above all, the barriers which kept them in their holy seclusion have long been so utterly prostrate; friends as well as foes, the most pious Christians as well as the most avowed enemies of Christian faith, have so long expatiated on this open field, that it is as impossible, in my judgment, as it would be unwise to limit the full freedom of inquiry.

"Such investigations, then, being inevitable, and, as I believe, not only inevitable but the only safe way of attaining to the highest religious truth, what is the right, what is the duty of a Christian historian of the Jews (and the Jewish history has, I think, been shown to be a legitimate province for the historian) in such investigations? The views adopted by the author in early days he still conscientiously maintains. These views, more free, it was then thought, and bolder than common, he dares to say not irreverent, have been his safeguard during a long and not unreflective life against the difficulties arising out of the philosophical and historical researches of our times; and from such views many, very many, of the best and wisest men whom it has been his blessing to know with greater or less intimacy, have felt relief from pressing doubts, and found that peace which is attainable only through perfect freedom of mind. Others may have the happiness (a happiness he envies not) to close their eyes against, to evade, or to elude these difficulties. Such is not the temper of his mind. With these views, he has been able to follow out all the marvellous discoveries of science, and all those hardly less marvellous, if less certain, conclusions of historical, ethnological, linguistic criticism, in the serene confidence that they are utterly irrelevant to the truth of Christianity, to the truth of the Old Testament, as far as its distinct and perpetual authority and its indubitable meaning."—Pp. v, vi.

The Dean then quotes the well-known passage of Dr. Paley in which he protests against that unscientific theology which would mingle together and place on equal authority all the separate books of the Bible, and make Christianity answerable for each separate passage of the Old Testament, and presently thus continues the subject :

"The revelation of moral and religious truth is doubtless the ultimate, I should say the sole, end of the Bible; nor is it difficult, according to ordinary common sense and to the moral instinct or judgement vouchsafed to man, to separate and set apart moral and religious truth from



all other human knowledge. For the communication of such truth, lawgivers, prophets, apostles, were gifted. This was their special mission and duty. This, as far as His character of TEACHER, was that of the Saviour himself. Lawgivers, prophets, apostles, were in all other respects men of like passions (take the word in its vulgar sense) with their fellow-men; they were men of their age and country, who, as they spoke the language, so they thought the thoughts of their nation and their time, clothed those thoughts in the imagery, and illustrated them from the circumstances of their daily life. They had no special knowledge on any subject but moral and religious truth to distinguish them from other men; were as fallible as others on all questions of science, and even of history, extraneous to their religious teaching. If this had not been the case, how utterly unintelligible would their addresses have been to their fellow-men! . . . This view has been sometimes expressed by the unpopular word *accommodation*—a bad word, as it appears to imply art or design, while it was merely the natural, it should seem inevitable, course of things. Their one paramount object being instruction and enlightenment in religion, they left their hearers uninstructed and unenlightened as before, in other things; they did not even disturb their prejudices and superstitions where it was not absolutely necessary. Their religious language, to work with unimpeded persuasiveness, adapted itself to the common and dominant knowledge and opinions of the time. This seems throughout to have been the course of Providential government: Lawgivers, prophets, apostles, were advanced in religious knowledge alone. In all other respects society, civilization, developed itself according to its usual laws. The Hebrew in the wilderness, excepting as far as the Law modified his manners and habits, was an Arab of the Desert. Abraham, excepting in his worship and intercourse with the One True God, was a nomad Sheik. The simple and natural tenor of these lives is one of the most impressive guarantees of the truth of the record. Endowed, indeed, with premature knowledge on other subjects, they would have been in a perpetual antagonism and controversy, not merely with the moral and religious blindness, with the passions and idolatrous propensities of the people, but with their ordinary modes of thought and opinion and feeling. And as the teachers were men of their age in all but religious advancement, so their books were the books of their age. If these were the oracles of God in their profound religious meaning, the language in which they were delivered was human as spoken by human voices and addressed to human ears.”—Pp. ix—xi.

In the original Preface to his third volume, Dr. Milman had said that his views of inspiration were nearly “those of Tillotson, Secker and Warburton.” On the subject of inspiration, this is his present cautious and judicious utterance:

“The moral and religious truth, and this alone, I apprehend, is the ‘Word of God’ contained in the Sacred Writings. I know no passage in which this emphatic term is applied to any sentence or saying which does not convey or enforce such truth.

“It is not unworthy, too, of remark, that the single passage in which there is a distinct assertion of inspiration, appears to sanction this limitation. This passage, as is known to every scholar, is by no means so clear as it is too often represented to be. It is an elliptic sentence; the

verb has to be supplied; and its meaning and force are in some degree affected by the collocation of the verb. 'All Scripture (is) God-inspired, and (is) profitable for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works,' &c. In any case, however, in its scope it signifies that the inspiration of Scripture, whatever it be, is intended for the promotion of religion and holiness in men. Such, too, seems to be the distinct sense of the Article of the English Church. These, and these only, are 'the things necessary to salvation,' which rest on Scripture, and on Scripture alone. Beyond this sacred range, all, I conceive, not only in science but also in history, is an open field. Whoever was the author or compiler of the Pentateuch, whether Moses or not, as he was not a premature Newton, Cuvier, Lyell, so neither was he, nor any of the other writers of the Old Testament, a premature Thucydides, Tacitus, or like one of our great modern historians. I cannot conceive, notwithstanding the Scriptural geologists, that the account of the Creation in Genesis was a dark prophetic enigma, of which no living man could comprehend the true sense for more than three thousand years, and which was only to be disclosed by the discoveries of our day. I am content with the great central truth, the assertion in its words, unapproachable in their sublimity, of the One Omnicreator—of that Creator's perpetual Presence and universal Providence. So, too, in the History (invaluable as much of it is, as preserving the most ancient traditions of our race), so that we preserve the grand outline of the scheme of Redemption, the Law, the Evangelical prophecies, I can apprehend no danger to the Christian faith if the rest, the frame as it were and setting around these eternal truths, be surrendered to free and full investigation, to calm, serious, yet fearless discussion."—Pp. xi, xii.

Some admirably discriminating remarks follow on the miraculous element in the Scriptures. While accepting the miracles, he declines to rest the defence of Revelation exclusively upon them. Dr. Milman then takes a few glances at the more important works on Jewish history which have appeared since his own History first saw the light. Like Dr. Stanley, he pays a tribute of admiration to the ingenuity and learning of Ewald, but intimates that the more he reads of Ewald's speculations, his conviction decreases. This writer seems to him to have attempted "an utter impossibility."

"That the Hebrew records, especially the Books of Moses, may have been compiled from various documents, and it may be at an uncertain time, all this is assuredly a legitimate subject of inquiry. There may be some certain discernible marks and signs of difference in age and authorship. But that any critical microscope, in the nineteenth century, can be so exquisite and so powerful as to dissect the whole with perfect nicety, to decompose it, and assign each separate paragraph to its special origin in three, four, or five, or more, independent documents, each of which has contributed its part, this seems to me a task which no mastery of the Hebrew language, with all its kindred tongues, no discernment, however fine and discriminating, can achieve. In this view (to raise but one objection), the ultimate compiler must have laid his hand



very lightly on the original documents, which still, it seems, throughout point unerringly to their age and author; he must have been singularly wanting in skill and in care in stringing together his loose materials. He must have built up his scattered fragments with extraordinary indifference or extraordinary negligence (of this, more hereafter), if a critic of our days can (as a scientific architect assigns part of a mediæval cathedral to one or another century, to one or another builder) resolve these most ancient records into their primeval elements, and that with a certitude which permits no doubt."—Pp. xxiii, xxiv.

On the merits of the late Baron Bunsen he speaks admiringly, but he does not conceal what he thinks a serious fault.

"But he seems to me to labour under the same too common infirmity, the passion for making history without historical materials. In this conjectural history, founded on conjectural grounds, he is as positive and peremptory (they often differ) as Ewald himself. I confess that I have not much sympathy for this, not making bricks without straw, but making bricks entirely of straw, and offering them as solid materials. If I have nothing but poetry, I am content with poetry; I do not believe in the faculty of transforming poetry into history. I fear that on some subjects we must be content to be ignorant; when facts and characters appear only in a loose, imaginative dress, we cannot array them in the close and symmetrical habiliments of historic times. I admire the industry, feel deep interest in the speculations of such writers, honour them for throwing even dubious illumination, as they unquestionably do, on the dark places of the annals of mankind. I fully appreciate what I may call the side lights thrown on history by the wonderful discoveries in ethnology and the science of language. But when I am reduced to conjecture (and that not seldom), I submit to conjecture: I claim not greater authority than more or less of probability. I retain firmly what I hold to be history; but where history is found only in what I may call a less historic form, though it may no doubt contain much latent history, when I cannot fully discriminate how much, I leave it in its native form; I attempt not to make it solid and substantial history."—Pp. xxiv, xxv.

On the subject of the age of the *Pentateuch* he deliberately retains the position he originally occupied.

"There are two theories between which range all the conclusions of what may be called the critical school: 1. That the *Pentateuch* in its present form is of very late date, the reign of Hezekiah, Josiah, Manasseh, or even subsequent to these. From what materials it was formed, and on the antiquity of those materials, opinions vary infinitely.

"2. That the *Pentateuch* even in its present form is of very high antiquity, as high as the time of Moses; but that it has undergone many interpolations, some additions, and much modification, extending to the language, in successive ages.

"If I am to choose, I am most decidedly for the second. For one passage which betrays a later writer or compiler, there are twenty which it seems in my judgement that no compiler at any of the designated periods could or would have imagined or invented, or even introduced. The whole is unquestionably ancient (I speak not of the authorship), only particular and separable passages being of later origin."—P. xxvii.

In a note on this passage he adds a remark on the Colenso view which assigns the Pentateuch to the age of Samuel:

"This appears to me by no means a happy conjecture. Among the most remarkable points in the Record in Exodus is the intimate and familiar knowledge of Egypt. All the allusions with which it teems to the polity, laws, usages, manners, productions, arts, to the whole Egyptian life, with which we have lately become so well acquainted, are minutely and unerringly true. Even the wonders are Egyptian, and exclusively Egyptian. But for the two or three centuries between the Exodus and Samuel, all intercourse with Egypt seems to have been entirely broken off. Between the Exodus and the Egyptian wife of Solomon (excepting an adventure with an Egyptian slave in David's wars), there is no word which betrays relation to Egypt. During the Judges, the Israelites are warred upon and war with all the bordering nations, of Egypt not a word. The writer of that book, as well as of those of Samuel, seem ignorant of the existence of such a country."—Pp. xxvii, xxviii.

On the subject of Bible chronology he confesses his utter inability to frame for himself, or to discover in the labours of others, a satisfactory scheme or theory. He alludes in a note to the dates inserted in the margin of the English Bible, which contain the views of Scaliger modified by Usher. When these chronological notes were first inserted does not seem to be ascertained. The authorized printers of our English Bible have no record of the innovation. Dr. Milman objects to the continuance of the notes, as giving, without ground, the apparent authority of the Church of England to an ideal chronology. A higher ground of objection to which also he alludes is, that it makes in popular estimation that part of the Bible which is no part of it.

On the subject of the numbers found in the Hebrew Scriptures, Dr. Milman, while thinking that more importance has been attached to it than really belongs to it, adheres to the opinion which he originally expressed, that the numbers as they appear in the sacred books are not tenable. He would extend the necessity of a revision of numerical statements to all early histories.

"If accuracy in numbers is to determine the historical credibility and value of ancient writers, there must be a vast holocaust offered on the stern altar of historic truth."—P. xxxi.

"Maintain the numbers as they stand (in our present Sacred Books), I see no way, without one vast continuous miracle, out of the difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities. Reduce them, and all becomes credible, consistent, and harmonious."—P. xxxii.

It will, we think, appear from the extracts we have been led to make from this interesting Preface, that the views propounded by Dr. Milman are substantially those which we have both recently and years ago maintained. They seem to us the only



grounds on which the Scriptures can be successfully defended as the record of a divine revelation. Most cordially do we assent to Dr. Milman's remark, that "in the works of writers hostile to revelation, the author has seen many objections embarrassing to those who take up a narrow system of interpreting the Hebrew writings; to those who adopt a more rational latitude of exposition, none."

The reprint of Professor Norton's observations on the Pentateuch is avowedly suggested by the Colenso controversy. They were originally appended (twenty years ago), as an illustrative note, to the work on the *Genuineness of the Gospels*, where their purpose seems to be to compare, or even to contrast, the spirit of Judaism with that of Christianity, and the evidences for the authenticity of their respective scriptures, to the manifest advantage of Christianity in each point of view. Mr. Norton, beginning with the position that "Christianity has made itself responsible for the fact that the Jewish religion, like itself, proceeded immediately from God," was unwilling to admit that the Christian Lawgiver could repeal any part of the old law; and so he somewhat arbitrarily held that the ceremonial Jewish law could not have been a part of the institutions of Judaism proper. He was thus disposed to look grudgingly upon the claims not only of the Pentateuch, but of the Jewish usage of sacrifice, to an early origin. We think this position equally unsound in respect to Judaism historically and to Christianity doctrinally. That Jesus Christ fulfilled the law in its spiritual and everlasting purposes, while abolishing its ceremonies ("nailing them to the cross") and uniting Jews and Gentiles in one hope, we never felt to be inconsistent statements. But Mr. Norton was unable, seemingly, to believe that the ceremonies could ever have been divinely authorized, when they were to be divinely proclaimed needless and burdensome afterwards. Yet we are quite at a loss to understand how the present learned editor can be justified in saying that Mr. Norton's conclusions respecting the age and authorship of the Pentateuch, as here published, were "substantially identical" with those of Bishop Colenso. Mr. Norton, as we read him, *concludes* nothing on the subject, except that nothing is to be concluded. He denies the Mosaic authorship, but he assigns no authorship instead. In his vagueness and uncertainty he is a perfect contrast to Colenso, who thinks he has discovered the exact date of all parts and the personal authorship of the Elohim portion. Mr. Norton thus sums up his own views:

"The general conclusion seems to be, that the revelation of God through Moses was made at so remote a period, that no contemporary or early history of it remains, though imperishable monuments of it exist in the effects which it produced; and that there was nothing in this communication of God to a peculiar people,—I do not say contrary to the spirit of the religion of Christ, for this it would be too absurd to

suppose,—but that there was nothing in it which the great messenger of God to the whole world was called upon or commissioned to abrogate. He came not ‘to annul the Law and the Prophets’—that is, the true religion of Moses—but ‘to perfect.’ There was an opposition between his religion and the contemporary religion of the Jews, that very corrupt religion which had gradually been formed in their nation; but certainly no opposition between his religion and that of Moses, if, as we believe, Moses was, like him, a messenger from God.”—P. 85.

In one place Mr. Norton seems disposed to date the composition of the existing Pentateuch as low down as the return from the captivity (p. 41), which is far later than the Colenso theory; but he speaks of it as “undoubtedly in great part a compilation, derived from ancient authorities, written or oral, or both, which was made for the purpose of embodying and preserving the traditions and national laws of the Jews” (p. 25); he recognizes in “some of its conceptions of the Infinite Being” what he thinks “very striking remains of the revelation by Moses, and of earlier communications of God to man” (p. 63); and his repeated assertion of the divine authority of Moses contrasts strongly with the doubtful way in which Colenso speaks even of his historical existence. In Section ii. he does justice to the great and inefaceable argument for the divine origin of Judaism, founded on the contrast between its grand and pure monotheism and the mythology of the most enlightened portion of the ancient world. Elsewhere he speaks so strongly of the proved inability of mankind to attain truly spiritual conceptions of God and a future state except through the aid of revelation, that the editor has entered his personal expression of dissent:

“He thinks it right to state here in general, that he differs considerably from Mr. Norton in his conception of the source and working of the religious principle in man. He is unable to persuade himself that the whole of man’s religious convictions and trusts depends entirely on the miraculously-attested mission of Jesus Christ, and on the simple apprehension by the understanding of the facts involved in that mission.”—Pref. p. v.

Now these are the editor’s words of disclaimer, but not Mr. Norton’s words of assertion. Mr. Norton says in brief: We must settle what religion is and what Christianity is. All religion is founded solely on two facts, the existence of God and the immortality of man. Religion must not, however, be confounded with superstition; they are essentially different. The alleged instinctive belief in God is no more than the necessary recognition, by even savage men, of powers *without* them and stronger than themselves. He says this is not religion. It does not constitute faith in God. Idolatry (he says) is represented in the Scriptures not as an imperfect developement of true religion, but as its opposite. He denies that there is any instinctive knowledge either of the being of God or of our own immortality.



Theoretically he grants that "a being of perfect reason might, from the phenomena of the present state known to man, infer not only the existence of God, but our power of attaining an immortal existence. But man is not a being of perfect reason." And the question, "What the collective wisdom of men, unassisted by revelation, can effect," has been answered in the beliefs of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero; in the state of religion among their contemporaries; in the mythology of the Hindoos, the adoration of human divinities by the Buddhists, &c. "The question is not what a few philosophers, unenlightened by revelation, have believed or imagined, but what the generality of men, unenlightened by revelation, have believed or imagined." "Our belief in God, then, as the Father of men, and our belief in our own immortality,—truths which may well seem to be too vast for human comprehension if we were left to our unassisted powers,—rest on our belief that their evidence is the testimony of God through the mission and teachings of Jesus Christ." Such is Mr. Norton's statement. He may be right or wrong in his definition of religion as excluding idolatry and superstition. But that true religion, that even an effective monotheism, has never existed in any nation except through means of Judaism or Christianity, is the simple fact of universal history. In this restricted sense of religion (which Theodore Parker would have called the absolute religion), Mr. Norton is quite correct in saying: "Religion is either identified with Christianity, or subsists in those who reject Christianity through its still remaining power; as an evergreen severed from its root may for a time retain the appearance of life" (pp. 7—11). We do not think this absolutism in the definition of the term religion either by Norton or by Parker is the philosophical use of the word; but the meaning of the former is at least clear, and he has only asserted the great facts of history, while theoretically admitting that the religious faculty in man *might* conceivably do what it never has done and cannot now have the opportunity of attempting.

These observations we have thought due to the memory of Mr. Norton, whose views of a miraculously revealed religion were so strong and decided that it seems strange to find him claimed as an ally to the very opposite scheme. In fact, he seems to have set up an ideal Moses teaching a theology too nearly identical with that of Christ to allow even the temporary admixture of ceremonialism. We think that, whatever be the assumed age of the Pentateuch itself, the Moses of Jewish history or tradition can scarcely come forth an anti-ceremonialist. It would be reversing the order of human history to make him so. But this was Mr. Norton's belief, and apparently the chief cause of his doubting the essentially Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

It might have been in reference to Mr. Norton himself, among

other excellent men, that Dr. Stanley, in the Preface to his Lectures on the Jewish Church, says:

"There are some excellent men who disparage the Old Testament, as the best means of saving the New. There are others who think that it can only be maintained by discouraging all inquiry into its authority or its contents. It is true that the Old Testament is inferior to the New, that it contains and sanctions many institutions and precepts (polygamy, for example, and slavery) which have been condemned or abandoned by the tacit consent of nearly the whole of Christendom. But this inferiority is no more than both Testaments freely recognize; the one by pointing to a Future greater than itself; the other by insisting on the gradual, partial, imperfect character of the Revelations that had preceded it. It is true also that the rigid acceptance of every part of the Old Testament as of equal authority, equal value and equal accuracy, is rendered impossible by every advance in Biblical science, and by every increase of our acquaintance with Eastern customs and primeval history. But it is no less true that by almost every one of these advances the beauty and the grandeur of the substance and spirit of its different parts are enhanced to a degree far transcending all that was possible in former ages."—Pref. pp. xv, xvi.

In the same Preface we have the following most philosophical remarks on the true mode of studying the Hebrew records. They are introductory, however, to a book that is not to be called critical in its visible processes of thought, though it is so to a great extent in the results set before the reader. Its power and value consist in presenting the familiar scenes in other than the familiar words, and with the aid of graphic and picturesque descriptions of Eastern places and manners, so as to give a sense of reality that is seldom experienced by the most implicit Bible believers. In this respect it greatly surpasses Milman's book; as indeed it ought to do, with the larger space which the accomplished author's own travels enable him to fill in connection with each scene described. It is not, however (as he reminds us), a history, but a series of lectures, presenting a succession of individual scenes and events. It is curious to find Dr. Pusey as well as Mr. Keble claimed as auxiliaries in clearing away the haze of "phantom worship."

"The Jewish history has suffered from causes similar to those which still, within our own memory, obscured the history of Greece and Rome. Till within the present century, the characters and institutions of those two great countries were so veiled from view in the conventional haze with which the enchantments of distance had invested them, that when the more graphic and critical historians of our time broke through this reserve, a kind of shock was felt through all the educated classes of the country. The same change was in a still higher degree needed with regard to the history of the Jews. Its sacred character had deepened the difficulty already occasioned by its extreme antiquity. That earliest of Christian heresies—Docetism, or 'phantom worship'—the reluctance to recognize in sacred subjects their identity with our own flesh and

blood—has at different periods of the Christian Church affected the view entertained of the whole Bible. The same tendency which led Philo and Origen, Augustine and Gregory the Great, to see in the plainest statements of the Jewish history a series of mystical allegories, in our own time has as completely closed its real contents to a large part both of religious and irreligious readers, as if it had been a collection of fables. Many, who would be scandalized at ignorance of the battles of Salamis or Cannæ, know and care nothing for the battles of Beth-horon and Megiddo. To search the Jewish records, as we would search those of other nations, is regarded as dangerous. Even to speak of any portion of the Bible as ‘a history,’ has been described, even by able and pious men, as an outrage upon religion.

“In protesting against this elimination of the historical element from the Sacred Narrative, I shall not be understood as wishing to efface the distinction which good taste, no less than reverence, will always endeavour to preserve between the Jewish and other histories. Even in dealing with Greek and Roman times, we must beware of an excessive reaction against the old system of nomenclature. An indiscriminate introduction of modern associations into the ancient or the sacred world is almost as misleading as their intire exclusion. But we shall be best preserved from such dangers by a true understanding of the actual events, persons and countries of which we profess to speak. And there are so many signs of returning healthiness in regard to Biblical History, that we need not fear for the result. It is one of the many debts of gratitude which the Church of England owes to the author of the ‘Christian Year,’ that he was one of the first among our divines who ventured in his well-known poems to allude to the scenes and the characters of the Sacred Story in the same terms that he would have used if speaking of any other remarkable history. It is for this reason, amongst others, that I have, on all occasions where it was possible, employed his language—now happily familiar to the whole of English Christendom—to enforce and illustrate my own descriptions. Similar examples of freely handling these sacred subjects in a becoming spirit may be seen (to select two works widely differing in other respects) in Dr. Robinson’s ‘Biblical Researches in Palestine’ and the Prefaces to Dr. Pusey’s ‘Commentary on the Minor Prophets.’ Indeed it may safely be said—and it is the almost inevitable result of an intimate acquaintance with the language, the topography, or the poetry of the Bible—that whoever has passed through any one of these gates into a nearer presence of the truths and the events described, will never again be able to speak of them with the cold and stiff formality which once was thought their only safeguard.”—Preface, pp. viii—xi.

A few pages further on, Dr. Stanley quotes Arnold as having written twenty-five years ago to Bunsen: “What Wolf and Niebuhr have done for Greece and Rome seems sadly wanted for Judea;” and he ascribes to Ewald the subsequent achievement of the required “critical and historical investigation of the Jewish history.” Guarding himself against the implied acceptance of all the learned German’s dogmatical conclusions, he avows his own immense obligation to Ewald’s History of the People of Israel.



The present volume of Lectures is but the first of a promised series. It embraces the first of the three periods into which the Jewish history naturally divides itself, namely, from Abraham to the institution of the Monarchy; the second period being that of the Monarchy, or Monarchies; and the third extending from the Captivity in Babylon to the fall of Jerusalem under Titus. The scope of Dr. Stanley's design is therefore the same as that of Dean Milman, except that the latter carries the history down much further. In the execution there is the difference between a rapid but careful history and a series of rapidly successive pictures, most of them highly elaborated and coloured.

Dr. Stanley's Lectures do not contribute directly to the settlement of the critical questions affecting the authorship or age of the Pentateuch. But they imply, embody and enforce a number of leading facts and phenomena which tend more to the practical solution of the question in minds of average intelligence and general knowledge, than any minute philological arguments. He touches the question of the number of the emigrants from Egypt (p. 122) more briefly even than Milman had done, simply to mark it as a matter of indifference to religious faith whether they were 600 or 600,000, but with a suggestion, derived from a nomad Tartar retreat, tending (as his custom is) to aid the credibility of the common belief. Without seeming to argue the question of the divine origin of Mosaism, he shews its points of contrast with the wisdom of the Egyptians in a way that does the amplest justice to the latter, but makes the monotheism of their Hebrew slaves appear the more manifestly a revealed belief and influence (p. 97). Without repeating Warburton's paradox, he shews how dim was the Hebrew conception of a future life, yet how strong the sense of the overwhelming greatness and nearness of their Divine Friend, which lay "too deep in the national belief to have had its beginning in any later time than the epoch of Moses. It is (he adds) the primary stratification of the religion. We should invert the whole order of the nation if we placed it amongst the secondary formations of subsequent ages" (p. 155). Willing apparently (p. 156, note) to ascribe the levitical ritual to the incident of the golden calf, which proved to Moses the incapacity of the people to retain his pure beliefs unmixed with outward representations, he thus vouches for the antiquity of the ritual law. Some of the distinctions of clean and unclean meats, again, could only have arisen in the desert; the laws of the blood-avenger, &c., not only mark the state in which it arose, but also "the high elevation of the people above that state, indicating the higher than any merely national source from whence they came" (pp. 168, 170). And the brazen serpent "could have originated nowhere else and in no other moment of their history" than in their journey through the eastern portion of the Sinaitic desert (p. 180).

While thus declaring and confirming at every step the essentially historical nature of the contents of the Pentateuch, he thinks he "need not discuss the vexed question of the precise time when the book of Deuteronomy assumed its present form" (p. 194); thus implying (what some of our recent critics seem to forget) that Deuteronomy is easily separable from the other books and requires a separate consideration. But parts even of Deuteronomy, he declares, "have every appearance of belonging to that stage of the history, and no other, when they were still beyond the Jordan;" and in his figurative and rather mystical way, he seems to leave room for holding, what we suppose no competent critic would deny, namely, that the Pentateuch, in its existing form, represents the growths and alterations of many editions or *recensions*, or whatever else may be the appropriate term for its progressive reproductions down to the days of Ezra. "If the features of the earlier law are from time to time transfigured with a softer and more spiritual light, this change, whilst it may have received some touches from the later spirit of the great prophetic age, yet is also in close harmony—it may be, dramatic harmony—with the soothing and widening process which belongs to the old age, not merely of every nation, but of every individual" (p. 194).

We must here quote his concluding words on the death of Moses. He has explained the "meekest of men" to mean "enduring," "afflicted," "heedless of self;" and finds the "highest type of this endurance and self-abnegation" in our last view of him on Pisgah:

"To labour and not to see the end of our labours; to sow and not to reap; to be removed from this earthly scene before our work has been appreciated, and when it will be carried on not by ourselves, but by others,—is a law so common in the highest characters of history, that none can be said to be altogether exempt from its operation. It is true in intellectual matters as well as in spiritual; and one of the finest applications of any passage in the Mosaic history is that made by Cowley, and extended by Lord Macaulay to the great English philosopher, who

'Did on the very border stand  
Of the blessed Promised Land;  
And from the mountain's top of his exalted wit  
Saw it himself, and show'd us it;  
But life did never to one man allow  
Time to discover worlds and conquer too.'

"In the first book of the *Novum Organum* we see the great Law-giver looking round from his lonely elevation on an infinite expanse; behind him a wilderness of dreary sands and bitter waters, in which successive generations have sojourned, always moving, yet never advancing, reaping no harvest and building no abiding city: before him a goodly land, a land of promise, a land flowing with milk and honey. While the multitude below saw only the flat sterile desert, in which they had so long wandered, bounded on every side by a near horizon,

or diversified only by some deceitful mirage, he was gazing from a far higher stand, on a far lovelier country, following with his eye the long course of fertilising rivers, through ample pastures, and under the bridges of great capitals, measuring the distances of marts and barns, and portioning out all those wealthy regions from Dan to Beersheba.' (Macaulay's *Essays*, p. 413.)

"The imagery thus nobly used to describe the promise and the self-denial of intellectual labour, is still more true of the many reformers, martyrs, and missionaries, John Huss, Tyndale, Francis Xavier, Howard, who, in all times of the Church, have died on the threshold of their reward, in hope, not in possession. Events have moved too slow, and the generation passes away which should have supported the saint or the chief; or events have moved too fast, and the rising generation has superseded the want of a leader; or a word has been spoken unadvisedly with his lips, and his prospects are suddenly overcast; or he is struck by decay of power, or by sudden, untimely death: again and again the Moses of the Church, of the commonwealth, lingers there, 'dies there in the land of Moab, and goes not over to possess that good land;' and Canaan is won, not by the first and greatest of the nation, but by his subordinate minister and successor, Joshua the son of Nun."—Pp. 200, 201.

For another quotation we must find room, illustrative alike of the author's theology and of his powerful and poetical style. It is that in which he speaks of the Ten Commandments, distinguishing them (as in their form and manner of delivery they were distinguished) above all the rest of the Mosaic law, and pointing out how *morality and religion are identified in them*:

"This was the form: what was the substance of the Ten Commandments? What has the human race gained by its adoption of what Burekhardt called 'the code of the Beni-Israel'? It is, in one word, the declaration of the indivisible unity of morality with religion. It was the boast of Josephus, that whereas other legislators had made religion to be a part of virtue, Moses had made virtue to be a part of religion. Of this, amongst all other indications, the Ten Commandments are the most remarkable and enduring example. Delivered with every solemnity of which place and time could admit, treasured up with every sanctity which Religion could confer, within the holiest shrine of the holiest of the holy places,—more sacred than altar of sacrifice or altar of incense,—they yet contain almost nothing of local or ceremonial injunction. However sacred the ritual with which they and the other moral laws were surrounded, yet we have the highest authority for distinguishing between what was essential and non-essential in the Mosaic institutions, and for believing that even the whole sacrificial system was as nothing compared with the Decalogue and its enforcements. 'I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.'

"If there was in the Fourth commandment the injunction to consecrate, by unbroken rest, the seventh day of every week, yet experience has shown how widely adapted the principle of this observance has



been to all times and countries. Even those who most zealously repudiate the obligation of the Mosaic Law, and who dwell most forcibly on the distinction between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, acknowledge that no other ancient ceremony has so maintained its hold on the world, and that without its antecedent support the observance of Sunday would hardly have exercised the beneficial influence which none deny to it. The Patriarchal rites of Circumcision and of Sacrifice have vanished away, but the name of the Sabbath of the Decalogue, the Sabbath of Mount Sinai,—as if it partook of the universal spirit of the code in which it is enshrined,—is still, as though by a natural anomaly, revered by thousands of Gentile Christians. If this be so even in the one exception to the spiritual and moral character of the Decalogue, much more is it with the remaining nine of these fundamental laws. ‘Thou shalt have none other gods but One,’ ‘Thou shalt do no murder,’ ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery,’ ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ are still as impressive and as applicable as when first heard and written. And if in the Second and Fourth and Fifth commandments some expressions retain a local and temporary character, yet these do but serve as proofs of the hoary antiquity from which they have come down to us. The words were ‘written by the finger of God,’ but the Tables were not less surely fragments hewn out of the rock of Horeb. Hard, stiff, abrupt as the cliffs from which they were taken, they remain as the firm, unyielding basis on which all true spiritual religion has been built up and sustained. Sinai is not a Palestine,—the Law is not the Gospel; but the Ten Commandments, in letter and in spirit, remain to us as the relic of that time. They represent to us, both in fact and in idea, the granite foundation, the immovable mountain on which the world is built up; without which all theories of religion are but as shifting and fleeting clouds; they give us the two homely fundamental laws, which all subsequent Revelation has but confirmed and sanctified,—the Law of our duty towards God, and the Law of our duty towards our neighbour.”—Pp. 175—177.

We have spoken of a certain tendency to mysticism as accompanying the highly poetical mind of this lecturer. The very title of the volume, and his apology for it, is an instance. His *History of the Jewish Church* really means that of the *Jewish People*, and not, as we might have imagined, the early Jewish, as distinguished from the Gentile, Christian Church. It is curious to read of the dispute between the herdsmen of Abraham and Lot as “the first *controversy*, the first primeval pastoral controversy, dividing the patriarchal church” (p. 91); of Abraham’s visit to Egypt as the “first contact of the church with the world” (p. 42); of Jacob’s leaving Beersheba and going towards Haran “as the first retrograde movement in the history of the church” (p. 58); and more curious still to find (at p. 260) that to the first appearance of the tribe of Judah on the stage of conquest “belongs the beginning of the JEWISH CHURCH, properly so called;” and to meet the apologetic avowal, “It is by a pardonable anachronism that we extend the word to the whole of the nation.” Even that very questionable person Balaam is made to figure as one of “the

teachers of the universal church, the higher spirits of every age and nation" (p. 188). The succession of the priesthood, in the case of Eleazar or Aaron's death, is to be unbroken down to our own times; the controversy between the settlers on the east and west of Jordan might by its amicable solution have saved the schism of the Eastern church from the Western; the sons of Eli are (not unaptly) a type of the grasping clergy of all ages (p. 375); Samuel is "the last representative of the ancient mediæval church of Judaism" (p. 392); and the schools of the prophets present the same fixedness of local continuity which distinguishes Oxford and Cambridge from the shifting philosophical schools of Greece (p. 397). Our author has a ready eye for *types*, which, however, he explains to us, "is, in fact, only the Greek word for *likenesses*;" and his fancy luxuriates freely in Esau and Jacob, every incident and word of the latter's experience at Mahanaim being "fraught with a double meaning."

At the same time it is curious to notice how fully the lecturer appreciates all the ordinary classical, secular and half-savage characters and exploits ascribed to Jephthah, Samson, Jael and the rest, whose "muscular" religion (for he adopts Mr. Kingsley's atrocious term) seems, however, to be not merely placed in its true historical position by him, but consecrated, more than we can really feel it to be, in the eulogiums of the Hebrew poets and historians. He enters so heartily into the position of Jael and Deborah as to shock our weak nerves by declaring of the latter, who sings the treacherous and horrid deed of the former: "Hers is the one voice of inspiration (in the full sense of the word) that breaks out in the book of Judges" (p. 328). Cromwell's wars in Ireland, glorified by Carlyle, and the horrors of the Sepoy rebellion in India necessitating stern suppression, are made to illustrate and vindicate the attempted extermination of the Canaanites; and Arnold's evasive comment, "It is better that the wicked should be destroyed a hundred times over than that they should tempt those who are as yet innocent to join their company," is all the satisfaction offered for the natural scruple, Is it credible that these things were done in obedience to a *direct Divine command*? Here is the gist of the matter. We may explain and partly vindicate such things on principles of human history under Divine Providence, but not as matters of alleged Divine precept.

On the subject of prophecy and inspiration we could wish for something a little more definite;—one of the Lectures on the Prophets, by the bye, is one of the Three Lectures on the Bible noticed in C. R. for February;—and on the subject of miracle we are hardly satisfied to be referred to the *Edinburgh Review*, No. 236, in which the various vague uses of the term *supernatural* for superhuman, supersensual, spiritual and divine, are laid bare, and it is shewn that the common orthodox reference of the

Christian's religious belief and experience to the class of the supernatural is a mere ignorant abuse of terms; yet the great question of the miraculous as lying at the foundation of revealed religion is ingeniously left untouched.

We must bring this long article to a close; yet we cannot do so without noticing what Dr. Stanley says about the names *Elohim* and *Jehovah*, and another divine appellation besides.

We have lately seen an ingenious, but at least very doubtful, attempt to settle the age of the Pentateuch by the use of these names. Dr. Stanley goes nearer to the root of the matter (whether the usage be applicable or not as a literary test afterwards) by saying that "the great epochs of the history of the chosen people are marked by the several names by which in each the Divine Nature is indicated" (p. 110). As regards *Elohim* and *Jehovah* this is plainly the case, at any rate. *Elohim* is the name "throughout the patriarchal or introductory age of the Jewish Church." It expresses the most general idea of divinity; "*El-Elohim*," "*the Strong One*," "*the Strong Ones*," "*the Strong*." Dr. Stanley seems to adopt Max Müller's conjecture that in *Elohim* (God), used since Abraham's time with a singular verb, is a "trace of the conciliatory, comprehensive mission of the first prophet of the true religion" (pp. 22, 110). We confess we do not so easily give up that very early and easy lesson in Hebrew which explains not only *Elohim*, but *Adonim*, *Baalim*, and other similar forms, as *plurals of dignity*,—God, lord, husband, &c. But the patriarchal use of the word is at least clear. *Jehovah* as clearly marks the developement of religion under Moses. "It was the declaration of the simplicity, the unity, the self-existence of the Divine Nature, the exact opposite to all the multiplied forms of idolatry, human, animal and celestial, that prevailed, as far as we know, everywhere else. THE ETERNAL. This was the moving spring of the whole life of Moses, of the whole story of the Exodus" (p. 111). As to the apparent use of the word *Jehovah* before this time, the lecturer passes that controversy by without even alluding to the too obvious explanation. He says "the only certain use of it before the time of Moses is in the name of Jochebed (*Jehovah my glory*) borne by his own mother," and approves Ewald's conjecture "that in the small circle of that family a dim conception had thus arisen of the Divine Truth which was through the son of that family proclaimed for ever to the world." We see no difficulty in regarding even Jochebed as a retrospective name for the else unknown mother of the lawgiver.

Dr. Stanley further thinks he finds, in the military character acquired by the Jews during the period of the Judges and confirmed in the establishment of the monarchy, the appropriate inauguration of the title "*Jehovah of Hosts*" (pp. 287, 387). This name makes its appearance first in the time of Samuel and



David. But that it means the God of armies, as expressed in the French Bible, and made to mean by courtly English clergymen when consecrating regimental colours or preaching war sermons, is, we think, an idea as unworthy of Hebrew criticism as of Christian devotion. Had it meant the God of armies, we might have looked for its inauguration by Joshua rather than by Samuel and David. But Sabaoth, or Zabaoth, is *not* the customary Hebrew word for armies and their hosts. It is believed to have denoted originally an orderly arrangement of multitudes, and to have had its first concrete application to the *host of heaven*, the sun, moon and stars; whence the worship of the heavenly bodies is called *Zabeism*, or *Sabeism*. In this, its usual application to the divine works, it is made to include those on earth also, as in Genesis ii. 1: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished and all the host of them" (not their army); and in the same sense it includes the rational inhabitants of all parts of God's dominions: "Bless ye Jehovah, ye his angels; bless ye Jehovah, *all ye his hosts* (not armies still), ye ministers of his that do his pleasure; bless ye Jehovah, *all his works*, in all places of his dominions" (Ps. ciii.). That it is applied sometimes, but comparatively seldom, to the order and mustering of armies, we are well aware; but that it has this implied meaning in the term "Jehovah of Hosts" in the beautiful passages in which psalmists and prophets use it, cannot be maintained with any fair regard to such connections. And what should we say of the progressive revelations of the true God as, first, *the Strong*; then *the Eternal*; and then *the God of Armies*? Is it not a dreadful retrogression at the third step? But here is indeed progress step by step: first, *the Strong*; then *the Eternal*; then *the Eternal of the Sabaoth*, of the divine universe, of the *kosmos* known and believed. There is but one step further to be taken, and the Jewish church must wait till Messiah takes it; we then obtain these steps of perfect progress in the revealed knowledge of God: the Strong; the Eternal; the Eternal of Universal Order; the Heavenly Father.

---

#### THE SACRED WRITERS.

Our first concern with the sacred writers is in their character of witnesses; and we should carefully distinguish in our minds the objections against their character as inspired persons, and objections against their character as trustworthy relators of facts. The question of the nature and extent of their inspiration legitimately comes in after the main facts have been established, which prove our Saviour's divine mission, and the promise of supernatural assistance which he made to his apostles. *Bishop Fitzgerald's Essay on the Study of the Evidences of Christianity in "Aids to Faith."*

# MATTHEW HENRY: A SHORT ACCOUNT OF HIS LIFE AND LABOURS;

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF LECTURES DELIVERED ON THE RE-OPENING OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHAPEL, CHESTER, AFTER IMPROVEMENTS INTENDED TO COMMEMORATE THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH.

BY J. K. MONTGOMERY.

WE celebrated the recent Bicentenary of St. Bartholomew's-day in considering the lessons and recalling some of the chief features of the religious struggles and controversies, and other ecclesiastical and political events, during the period between the commencement of the Reformation under Henry VIII. and the passing of the Act of Uniformity in the reign of the second Charles. Bearing these in remembrance, we shall be able better to understand the origin of our English Presbyterian chapels, and also the character and principles and work of their founders.

The Presbyterians were driven from the State Church by the Act of Uniformity, which demanded of them a declaration of unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained in its Book of Common Prayer and its Thirty-nine Articles; whilst it was known that their Puritan faith regarded many of their teachings as opposed to the Holy Scriptures, and that many of the ceremonials which they either enforced or countenanced were offensive to their Puritan feelings and their Protestant principles. And they were not only thus driven from the Church of which they had been faithful ministers, but were subsequently cruelly harassed by the penalties of many persecuting statutes.

Their Puritan spirit and training had taught them the sacredness and majesty of conscience, and the duty of unwavering obedience to its authority. The principles of religious liberty also had grown up and been strengthened within them by the long discipline of their religious struggles and fiery trials. They may not, indeed, have comprehended the full extent of their bearings. But they had learned to understand the right and to value the liberty to worship God according to the faith of their hearts and in fidelity to Christ, the one Master, and to the gospel, the one rule of faith and life to Christians. In the exercise of this right—sometimes in despite of the law, or encouraged by occasional laxity in the enforcement of its penalties, or taking advantage of indulgence granted by the King, and eventually of a happy change in the law itself following the memorable Revolution of 1688—the early Nonconformists, or their immediate successors, as in this place, erected “meeting-houses” or chapels for the freer worship of God than was permitted to them in the Church from which they were excluded, or than is now permitted within its pale to Christians of free thought and of like honest minds and of unpervverted and tender consciences. And having devout

trust in God and Christ and divine truth, they were satisfied to dedicate the chapels thus erected to the worship and service of Almighty God, or to place them in trust, as with this chapel, for "the public worship of God amongst Protestant Dissenters;" leaving to their successors that religious freedom which themselves so highly prized and had so dearly won.

Surely then, brethren, it becomes us this day, on entering again our venerable place of worship after its outward renovation, to re-dedicate it in our hearts and by our prayers to the same holy purpose—the public worship of God; that in the same spirit of devout trust in God and Christ and Christian truth which animated its founders, and in like respect for the liberty and rights of the Christian conscience, we may transmit it to our successors without other condition than that on which its inheritance has descended to those who now stately worship here.

But we should also feel deeply the truth so happily, if somewhat quaintly, expressed in the couplet,

They who in glorious ancestors enlarge  
Produce their *debt* instead of their discharge;

and faithfully endeavour to discharge our obligation. We best do so, surely, even whilst affixing no sectarian designation to the *buildings* which they erected, by that Christian faithfulness to our personal convictions of which they have left us so noble an example; by like manly adherence to, and the earnest advocacy of, what we believe, with like heart faith to theirs, to be most in harmony with divine truth, the spirit and teachings of Christ, the Master whom *they* alone acknowledged; and assenting to no articles of belief deemed at variance with the Holy Scriptures, reverently interpreted by the exercise of those faculties which are the gift of God to his children; under like deep sense to theirs of accountability to God, but to Him alone, for their exercise, and as respects the Christian belief in which it results. And also, brethren, by shewing our fellowship with them in bearing, as they did, whatever obloquy or suffering, and in cheerfully making whatever sacrifices, may be still occasioned by the profession of our Christian faith, or in maintaining our religious liberty or our civil rights as Nonconformists. This, I take it, is the high ground of our claim to be the true representatives of the English Presbyterians of the 17th century, though we accept not every article of their Puritan belief, and even whilst our Christian theology may differ widely from theirs.

Matthew Henry was amongst the earliest and most notable of the second generation of Presbyterian Nonconformists. And to commemorate the bicentenary of his birth, this chapel, of which he was the founder, has been renovated, in order to preserve it in a condition worthy of its venerable associations and traditions; and the tablet to his memory which we now dedicate has been placed close to the pulpit from which for a quarter of a century



he so earnestly and so effectively preached the gospel and opened up the Scriptures for the blessing and the comfort of many. He believed and therefore spake according to his light of faith and his convictions of divine truth. And I have thought that on this occasion the character and principles and labours of Matthew Henry would be an appropriate and useful, as well as interesting, subject of discourse.

At Broad Oak, in the township of Iscoid, in Flintshire, resided a scholarly and meek and single-minded servant of Christ. He sought there, in the retirement of private life, that peace and quietness denied him in the exercise of the ministry to which he was so devoted in the neighbouring village of Worthenbury, the scene of his earliest labours. Too truthful to purchase peace and continued ministry in his parish by the sacrifice of his principles or unfaithfulness to his conscience, he was obliged soon after the passing of the Act of Uniformity to abandon his church and home, and to retire somewhat hurriedly to the little estate at Broad Oak, which was the least valuable part of the dowry received with his wife. They had scarcely been settled in their new residence, with their only child, when, amid the confusion incident to their hasty removal, a second son was added to their household. This was Matthew Henry. His father was that Philip Henry, with whose genial nature, quiet and Christian spirit, together with the chief facts and features of his life, all are acquainted who have read the touching tribute of filial reverence, the beautiful biography of his father, from the pen of Matthew Henry; or who either heard or have read the interesting and faithful sketch of "*Puritan Life in the Seventeenth Century*," as illustrated in the domestic and ecclesiastical relations of Philip Henry, by a lineal descendant of congenial spirit; one of a course of Bicentenary Lectures delivered in London, which was repeated in this and other pulpits, and has since been published. Most of you are thus sufficiently familiar with the saintly character and life of Matthew Henry's father, which had so great an influence in forming his own.

His mother's influence was not less good, and scarcely less important. Here is a portrait of her drawn by the affectionate hand of her son on the solemn occasion of her death. "She was one that looked well to the ways of her household. She provided well for it with ease and order; was a prudent counsellor, and knew well how to advise others. And she answered all the characters of Solomon's virtuous woman. And if her children that reap so much benefit by her good example, and the good education she gave them, do not rise up and call her blessed, let everybody call them ungrateful, and you can call them nothing worse." Of his good and worthy mother, her son also said that "in her sphere and capacity she was not inferior to what his father was in his."

These were the parents of Matthew Henry, by whose example and training, and the Christian and Puritan influences of the home which they made so happy to their children, his early character and life were so largely moulded.

Born on the 18th of October, in the memorable year 1662, the child Matthew had drawn the breath of mortal life but a single day when his devout father dedicated him in baptism to that Christian and eternal life which in later years he so effectively commended to others by his teachings and example. The formality of sponsors was dispensed with on the occasion out of deference to Philip Henry's scruples. But the officiating clergyman not daring to omit the sign of the cross,—“Then, Sir, let it lie at your door,” was the declaration by which the Puritan father absolved his conscience.

The infantile disease of which his elder brother died when six years old, was nearly proving fatal also to the second son of Philip Henry. He was happily spared. But the disease left seeds of weakness which he did not outgrow for some years. In childhood he was remarkable for precociousness and diligence in his juvenile studies; and when only three years old he could read a chapter in the Bible not only with distinctness, it is said, but with some understanding of the matter. For the sake of all concerned, it is to be hoped that they were some of those simple passages which all children delight to hear or read; telling of the little Samuel and the little coat which his mother made him year by year; and how he early took heed to the voice of God within, revealed in visions of the night, “Speak, Lord, thy servant heareth;” or of the child Jesus, that he grew in wisdom and in favour with man and God, and, as a boy, was subject unto his parents. For there is something beautiful even in St. Paul being able to say, “When I was a child I thought as a child, I understood as a child, I spake as a child.” Yet one cannot help feeling that good Philip Henry's words, written of the son whom he had lost, were true of his little Matthew also,—“*Præterque ætatem nil puerile fuit*,”—for assuredly there seems to have been nothing childlike about him except his age.

Like Timothy, even from a child he had knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. And that early sensibility to religious impressions, which led to his very strong predilection for the ministry even when a child, is shewn by many incidents related of his earliest years. It is said that even as a child he was often so moved by his father's sermons, that at the close of the service he would retire to his room weeping and praying that the good impressions made might not be effaced; yet so great was his fear of this at times that he could not be persuaded to appear at dinner. On one occasion he was so full of concern to possess true grace (the nature of which had been the subject of discourse), that he communicated his anxieties to his father, and soon afterwards exult-

ingly declared to one of his sisters that he "he hop'd he had received the blessed grain of true grace."

Yet is it not without a feeling of pain that we find him at the age of thirteen recording, in the form of a "catalogue of mercies," as amongst the results of his spiritual "experience," that when about eleven years old, having heard a sermon on the "Marks of True Grace," "I tried myself by them, and told my father my evidences;" adding, "yet after this, for two or three days I was under great fear of hell, till the Lord comforted me." Some of the marks of conversion set down certainly indicate a religious experience very unusual at such an age, if not to be ascribed to a theological bias received from the Puritan influences by which he was surrounded, or to the Puritan modes of speech prevalent in those days, as some of the views respecting the corruption of his nature and the sense of personal sinfulness which he expresses assuredly are, rather than to any actual condition of his own heart and conduct, both so truly pure.

Rarely indeed has the religion of domestic life been more purely or strongly developed than in the home circle at Broad Oak. It was part of the family discipline that the young people should spend an hour together in devotional exercises on the Saturday, in preparation for the Sabbath. Matthew, being the eldest, always presided on these occasions; and if he thought that his sisters unduly curtailed their prayers, he would gently expostulate: "It was impossible (he would say) in so short a time to include all the cases and persons they had to commend to God;" and those patient, exemplary sisters took it very kindly, and often acknowledged how much they had been influenced and encouraged by their brother's example and words of counsel, so good and wise beyond his years. It is not surprising, then, to find that he cared little for the ordinary diversions of childhood, and that his chief pleasure even as a child was in the society and conversation of older persons of serious and religious minds.

Happy the child whose early feet  
The paths of peace have trod,  
Whose secret heart with influence sweet  
Is upward drawn to God.

But we like to feel that, however sweet the producing influences, early piety is also simple, childlike, loving, cheerful. Still, what may appear even unattractive under a change of circumstances, may yet be perfectly natural and genuine and even beautiful according to the standard to which it was conformed.

It must not be supposed, however, that Matthew Henry's childhood was either prevailingly sad or uncheerful. Indeed, he is said to have had "a very easiful and cheerful disposition;" but it is questionable whether his nature was ever as genial as his father's. He was always of very active habits and could not bear to be idle. He was so diligent, in truth, that his judicious



mother often used to send him out for a walk into the fields, that his health might not suffer from too close application to his books ; and to his praise let it be mentioned that he was always a dutiful son, and shewed great respect and deference to his parents, which is more perhaps than could be said for all the youths of this generation, many of whom in this respect fall so far short of those in Puritan times, two hundred years ago.

Young Henry received his education for the most part under the tuition of his cultivated father, with the occasional assistance of some of the young men, students for the ministry or about to enter the university, who had the privilege of being received into the family of Philip Henry. One of these, a Mr. Turner, initiated young Matthew into the mysteries of grammar. He was always diligent, had great facility in acquiring knowledge and an excellent memory, so that he made good progress in his studies ; and at an early age he was even familiar with Hebrew.

When about eighteen, he went to an academy at Islington, then a suburb of London, conducted by the Rev. Thomas Doolittle, who was one of the few ministers who, uniting the functions of schoolmaster to the office of preacher, yet "made religion his business," and was "a warm and affectionate preacher." On being ejected from the living of Alphage, he commenced a school at Moorfields ; but on the breaking out of the Plague, he removed for the safety of his pupils to the village of Woodfordbridge. On returning to London, he opened a meeting-house, and was soon obliged to erect a larger one to accommodate his increasing congregation. His labours, however, were interrupted by the interference of the Lord Mayor. His pulpit was pulled down. The doors of his chapel were closed, with the royal seal affixed to them. The building was appropriated by, and used as a chapel for the Lord Mayor. But a licence from the Crown subsequently enabled Mr. Doolittle to resume preaching in his former chapel and to commence an academy at Islington.

Matthew Henry was one of his later pupils, and spoke of his tutor as "very studious and diligent." And he also must have been diligent and studious, for within two years he wrote that, "through the blessing of God upon his studies, he had made some progress in knowledge of the languages, arts and sciences." But on the passing of the Oxford Act, Mr. Doolittle was driven from Islington and his academy broken up ; and after an absence of about two years we find young Henry again at Broad Oak.

His early seriousness and piety had not suffered by removal from the home influences under which they had been developed. Having given himself to God heart and soul, his religious principles and feelings were too deeply rooted to be much affected by his new experiences of the world and his wider intercourse with others in society. And his letters from London at this period give evidence of a maturity not only of thought and style,

but of religious character, seldom found in the best young men at an age still short of twenty.

Yet in a memorial of "mercies received," bearing date "die natali 1682," about the time of his return from Islington, there occurs one of those touches of nature which makes kin of all the world, and points to a trait of character in Matthew Henry which, revealing itself at twenty, adhered to him through life; shewing that, however careful to cultivate the inner life and to make spiritual things his *chief* concern, he was yet by no means wanting in worldly prudence, nor at all indifferent to the advantages of outward blessings and of social position. Here is the item, 1682, entered as amongst mercies received: "That I was born to a competent estate in the world, so that (so long as God pleases to continue it) I am likely to be on the *giving* and not on the *receiving* side,"—a comfortable state, prospectively, of ministerial independence, devoutly and gratefully acknowledged.

Young Henry's public school education began and ended at the academy of Mr. Doolittle. His father, who was an accomplished scholar and a graduate of Oxford, though he valued highly both scholarship and a university training, yet decided not to subject his son to the then corrupting influences of his own alma mater, so changed and so likely to be dangerous to his religious principles, personal piety and morals. But though thus deprived of many advantages in respect of scholarly training only to be enjoyed, perhaps, at our national universities, yet were there many compensations—in the superintendence over his religious education as well as his secular studies of one so well skilled both in human learning and divine wisdom, and in the daily example and gentle leading of his meek and devout father, and in home influences, at Broad Oak so truly good and happy. These were his fitting preparation for his early chosen work of the ministry, for which he continued diligently to pursue his studies for about three years after his return from Mr. Doolittle's academy.

But the prospects in the ministry amongst Nonconformists were then far from encouraging. The two or three and twenty years which had elapsed since the passing of the Act of Uniformity had brought but little increase either of peace or of prosperity to the Presbyterians, so far as these depended upon court favour, episcopal goodwill or popular regard. Even the indulgence granted by a careless and self-indulgent sovereign had been withdrawn; and the King dying about this time, the Nonconformists had little confidence in his successor. His Popish tendencies alarmed them. Any concessions he might grant would be quite as much with a view to favour the Papists as to relieve the Nonconformists. The truth is, they were yet too narrow even to desire toleration which included Romanists also. And

the Parliament was in no temper to listen to any very liberal measures for relief of tender consciences. Scarcely will it yet, even in this 19th century. But corporations seldom feel the pinch of conscientious scruples. Things on the whole looked dark and gloomy for the Nonconformists, however hope might take courage from any occasional fringing of light upon the clouds suggestive of their silver lining. Moreover, though their principles and consciences had made the ejected ministers confessors and nonconformists, it is not certain that they would lead them to urge their sons to enter a profession which still entailed upon its members so many sacrifices and even sufferings. Sufficient that they did not forbid or discourage when natural tastes and inclinations led to its voluntary adoption. Matthew Henry, too, was still under three-and-twenty, possessed of considerable ability and quickness of apprehension—the power of getting at the truth of subjects brought before him, with great aptitude for study and extreme diligence in pursuit of knowledge.

It was under these circumstances that the counsels of an influential friend prevailed, and it was decided that he should commence the study of law. It would at least enlarge the range of his knowledge and give him the opportunity of entering the legal profession, should his later tastes or inclinations turn toward pursuits which promised greater worldly advantages with fewer personal and social inconveniences. Consequently in April, 1685, he was entered at Gray's Inn. He applied himself with characteristic diligence to his new studies, though he confesses that he frequently escaped from the dry details of law to some more agreeable reading or pursuit. Yet during the short time he spent at Gray's Inn he gained considerable legal knowledge; and doubtless had he adopted the law instead of the gospel as his profession, he would have attained to eminence at the bar, as he did in the Christian ministry. His legal studies, however, seem neither to have affected his inclination towards, nor changed his purpose of devoting himself to, the work of the ministry. But their influence is clearly traceable in his writings, in the use of legal terms and in quotations shewing acquaintance with books scarcely within the ordinary range of literary or theological reading.

At Gray's Inn he found several fellow-students of somewhat congenial mind and of virtuous habits. They were mutually attracted, and an intimate friendship sprung up amongst them. Young Henry even then had evidently the power of influencing others for good; and he promoted amongst his new friends meetings for prayer and religious conversation, at which he occasionally also expounded the Scriptures to them. He was at this time little more than a year at Gray's Inn. His leave-taking of his friends was as novel, perhaps, as it was characteristic. His



adieu took the form of a sermon, recommending that blessed *ἐπισυναγωγή*, the heavenly gathering together, as the great source of comfort under all present partings.

The religious tendencies of his mind at this period are also strongly brought out in a letter written from Gray's Inn to his cherished friend Mr. Illidge, of Nantwich, interesting only, perhaps, from this circumstance. After asking, "What shall I write?" he goes on: "You know I was never a good newsmonger; and to fill a letter with idle, impertinent compliments is very useless, and will pass but ill at the last day. What if I should therefore give you a few serious lines which may be of some spiritual advantage to your soul"—which he proceeds to do in truly Puritan style and at truly Puritan length.

His residence at Gray's Inn afforded him the opportunity of hearing some of the most eminent of the London divines, both in the Church and amongst the Nonconformists. He was greatly attracted by the accomplished Stillingfleet and the learned Tilotson. Accustomed to the unctuous preaching of Philip Henry, he would no doubt be a fastidious hearer, as he would be no mean critic in such case.

Shortly after his arrival in London, he had an interview with the celebrated Richard Baxter, the great leader of the Presbyterian party. It occurred during his imprisonment for violation of the "Five-Mile Act," under a sentence pronounced by "the contemptible and scurrilous Jeffries," as young Henry styles the Judge who, more than any that ever sat upon the English Bench, disgraced his ermine. The counsel of the honoured sufferer for conscience' sake made a deep impression upon young Henry, and tended no doubt to confirm principles and convictions in his mind to which he was ever afterwards so true.

He returned to Broad Oak in the summer of 1686, strengthened in his choice of the ministry as his profession. His decision gave his mother unfeigned pleasure; and good Philip Henry, though he had abstained from influencing his son, was also well pleased. He was strongly confirmed in this decision by the very successful result of his first services as a preacher. Whilst on a visit at Nantwich this summer, and at the urgent request of his friend, he preached every night at the house of Mr. Illidge. Some irreligious persons who attended out of mere curiosity were seriously awakened, and received much benefit. And so the young preacher was greatly encouraged, and a good report of him went abroad.

And now the time drew near when he must leave behind the happy intercourse and gentle influences of the dear circle at Broad Oak, and the quiet studies so long and diligently pursued there under such judicious guidance and so happy circumstances, soon to enter upon the active duties of that ministry to which he had consecrated himself, as it were, from childhood. And

few, indeed, were ever better prepared for the sacred office, whether by personal tastes and natural abilities; by the early training and devout home influences under which his religious nature had been drawn out and received its bent; by long-continued and varied studies, secular and sacred; by his early love for, and his thorough knowledge of, the Scriptures; and his great facility in using and happy art of applying his knowledge to the concerns of life and for the religious improvement of others. In all respects, few were ever better prepared for the holy office of the Christian teacher than the son of Philip Henry.

His connection with Chester dates from the end of the year 1686. Of its origin, the circumstances of his settlement with the congregation of which this is the direct successor, and of its progress during his ministry in this community, he has left a brief record in the chapel books, written in his own neat but minute handwriting, now somewhat difficult to decipher. It is particularly valuable, apart from its interest as a chapel record and as a MS. of its distinguished writer, as supplying some few links that are missing in his life and some facts which have been omitted by his biographers.

Some few months after his successful ministrations at Nantwich already mentioned, a Mr. Henthorn, from Chester, visited Broad Oak one Lord's-day. The object of this visit does not appear; and the nature of the "business" which soon afterwards called young Mr. Henry to Chester he modestly veils in his MS., and his biographers throw no light upon the subject. Upon both points, indeed, they have left their readers, and may have been themselves, in the dark. But putting together the facts on record, in print or in MS., a plausible conjecture may be formed tending to solve the doubt in respect of both points. Looking at the state of things in Chester, a small band of shepherdless Nonconformists, who after the death of their previous pastors (Mr. Cook and Mr. Hall, both ejected ministers, and both removed at an advanced age in 1684), had kept together and worshiped privately at the house of a Mr. Henthorn, wishing to form a new congregation, were now anxious for a suitable minister. A good report of the young preacher, then at Broad Oak, had reached them; and one Lord's-day, when he would doubtless be preaching for his father, a gentleman from Chester joins their worship. Immediately after, as Matthew Henry records (MS.), "*some business drew me twice or thrice to Chester, and I lodged at Mr. Henthorn's, who a little before had been at Broad Oak on a Lord's-day, and understood that I had sometimes preach'd, and therefore urged me to preach at his house in the evening, which I did two or three times. I also preach'd at Mr. Harvey's (the only somewhat aged and respected Nonconformist minister in the city), and once at Mr. Jolly's; and had the happiness of contracting an intimate acquaintance with that worthy and pious*

gentleman, Mr. Edward Greg, a man of an excellent, sweet temper and great usefulness." Putting these circumstances together then, can there be any doubt (however modestly and skillfully the fact is veiled) that these visits of Mr. Henthorn's to Broad Oak on a Lord's-day, and Mr. Henry's subsequent visits to Chester, were the delicate method taken by the shepherdless flock to hear and to secure the services of the promising young preacher as their pastor? These the circumstances then, and Mr. Henthorn's house in Whitefriars the place, of Matthew Henry's first preaching in Chester.

The persecution of the Nonconformists had begun to be discountenanced by the Court, and in the January following these visits there were strong hopes of indulgence from King James; and in that month the Mr. Henthorn and Mr. Greg already mentioned went to Broad Oak to solicit Mr. Henry's promise that if the King granted the expected liberty he would come to Chester and be their minister. He thus mentions the circumstance (MS.): "I was then in the 25th year of my age, and was determined in the strength of God's grace to apply myself to the work of the ministry; and though it was a surprise to me (so he modestly refers to the solicitations of his Chester friends), I thought there was a providence in it. And therefore, with the advice of my father, I gave them some encouragement to hope that I would comply with their desires, with this proviso, which (though very honourable to him, he says) they were uneasy at, that Mr. Harvey would consent to my coming; but at that time I was going to London to reside there at Gray's Inn, and I did."

Thus matters remained for some months. His intention of entering the ministry being known, many inducements were offered to him to settle in London. But he says (MS.) that his Chester friends, especially the two already mentioned by name, "ply'd me with letters, earnestly pressing me to perform my intention to come to Chester; assuring me that Mr. Harvey had consented to my coming; others also were forward in joining them in their importunity."

The proclamation of the expected indulgence was issued on the 4th of April, 1687; and early in May, Mr. Henthorn, being in London, "was personally very urgent with me in the matter, and at length I agreed to hasten down" (MS.). Such was the progress of the negociation and its happy result.

Having thus finally committed himself at once to the work of the ministry, and to Chester as the scene of his labours, he began solemnly to prepare for his ordination, first satisfying himself by serious and searching self-examination as to his call to and fitness for the holy office he was undertaking, and the views and feelings and motives with which he entered upon the work of the ministry. He had next to consider the mode of his ordination; whether he should seek it at the hands of a Bishop of the



English Church, as he was strongly urged to do by some of his friends, who intimated that, as it was thought, the ordaining Bishop might give him indulgence in the points on which he had scruples; or whether he should be ordained by laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. He argues the case, with its many pros and cons, with great impartiality and considerable display of legal acumen; and at length gave judgment in favour of the *duty* as well as lawfulness of being ordained amongst the Nonconformists; and so resisted the temptation, which he felt strongly, of being ordained into the communion of the Church. He comforts himself, in view of this result, with the reflection that even if silenced, should things come to the worst, it would be in good company. He adds: "I am apt to think that a man might comfortably suffer for these two truths—1, That ordination by Presbyters is (though not the only valid), yet the best, most scripturally regular, and therefore the most eligible, ordination; 2, That Jesus Christ never meant to make any of his ministers really priests, sacerdotés, otherwise than spiritual priests, as all believers are; nor that he ever meant to necessitate all his ministers to be deacons, i.e. but overseers to the poor, or at best but *half* ministers at the first." Having after the most careful and deliberate examination arrived at this conclusion, and cast in his lot with Nonconformity, he never for one moment wavered; but till the close of his life was a Nonconformist from deep conviction and fidelity to conscience.

"In prospect of my settlement at Chester (he says, MS.), I was solemnly ordained in London on May 9, 1687, but privately in *Mr. Steel's house*, by the imposition of the hands of six ministers (with fasting and prayer), of whom *Mr. Wickens was president*, who had been a member of the London class above forty years. *Mr. Steel preached, and many prayers were put up for me, which I trust I have far'd the better for. I then made my ordination vows particularly, which are still a bond upon my soul* (written in 1710). *It was a day never to be forgotten. I had been examin'd by them a week before in the several parts of learning, and had exhibit'd a thesis in Latin upon a question given me, and defend'd it; and had preached my probation sermon at Mr. Lawrence's.*"

I have been thus particular in giving the account of his ordination in Matthew Henry's own words, because some of the facts which are mentioned have never appeared in print, and seem to have been unknown to or overlooked by his biographers, who have left in doubt some points of considerable interest as to his ordination, which he had left means of clearing up.\*

As usual on such occasions, young Mr. Henry made his confession of faith. In substance it was to this effect:

---

\* These are marked in italics.

“I believe that there is a God, an incomprehensible, perfect Being, a Spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice and truth, having being of himself and giving being to all things.

“I believe that the Living and True God is but One; and that in the Unity of the Godhead there is a Trinity of Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and that these three are but one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory. This is a revealed mystery (sic) which I do believe but cannot comprehend.”

He believed that God did create, out of nothing, all things visible and invisible, and “this He did by the word of his eternal power in the space of six days, and all very good;” and that He governs all his creatures and all their actions according to the counsels of his own will.

He believed that God gave a law to his rational creatures according to which they are to walk; but that the Old and New Testament are the only rule of faith and practice to men *now*.

He believed that the image of God in which man was made consisted in knowledge, righteousness and holiness. But that left to the freedom of his will, at the instigation of the devil he sinned, and so fell from his estate of holiness and happiness; and that all his posterity fell with him into an estate of sin and misery, and are born children of disobedience, their whole nature corrupt, slaves to the flesh and the world and the devil, children of wrath, obnoxious to God’s justice and condemnation of the law, from which no creature is able to deliver them.

But he believes that a remnant are elected to everlasting life, God’s wisdom finding out the means to deliver them, by giving his only-begotten Son to be their Redeemer, who, though he lived a sinless life, yet underwent the miseries of this life and the wrath of God for our sins, and “as a sacrifice for sin died a cursed death upon the cross, thereby satisfying Divine justice” for our sins, and “so to *reconcile us to God*.”

He believes that all are eternally saved who come to Jesus Christ with lively faith, truly repent, renounce the world, the flesh and the devil, and their own righteousness in point of justification, and serve Christ (sincerely, though not perfectly) in all manner of obedience.

He believes that the Holy Ghost effectually applies the redemption purchased by Christ to all the elect, continually dwelling in them and keeping them steadfast unto the end.

He believes that all true believers make up one invisible, holy church, and that all by baptism professing faith in Christ as the *true Messiah* are the visible church of Christ.

He believes that God will judge the world by that man whom he hath ordained, who will raise the *bodies* of men, judge them according to their works, sending the wicked into everlasting punishment and receiving the righteous into everlasting life, and

that then Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all.

Such is the substance of Matthew's belief at the time of his ordination. In its chief features it is strictly orthodox, in the popular sense of the term. Yet, with the exception of some very strong expressions—for Matthew Henry never minced matters—respecting the Fall and consequent corruption and ruin of mankind, and the remedy in the redemption through the cross as a satisfaction to Divine justice, there is a general guardedness and moderation which contrasts favourably with many popular statements upon the same topics. Indeed, on some points there is a cautious adherence to the words of Scripture which suggests rather an intellectual assent than a heart faith; and even in his harsh statement as to the future condition of the wicked, there is no opinion expressed as to the eternal torments of the great masses of mankind usually accompanying popular expressions of that doctrine. There is no mention either of the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation in connection with the doctrine of election; whilst the views expressed as to remedial measures indicate a heart-leaning towards hopeful and benevolent views of human destiny. Whether his harsher statements concerning human condition are to be considered as the result of early theological bias, having no deep root in personal feeling,—or simply as the utterance of the abhorrence of a pure and earnest mind at every departure from the standard of holy living and feeling which as a child was set up in young Henry's heart,—it is certain that there are no subsequent statements on the same points of equal harshness in the writings of Matthew Henry, and that it was contrary, in truth, to the whole spirit of his ministry and tone of his preaching,—ever that “the promise of eternal life is offered upon reasonable terms *to all men*. The offer is *free* and general. . . . The gate is open and the way plain. . . *It is true* multitudes miss it and are lost for ever, but it is *as true* that it is their own fault.” He preached free grace and free salvation unto all. His subsequent treatment of these very points shews much more tenderness, and was with a view to practical usefulness, whilst their statement is generally couched in Scripture language. But this matter will come before us again in considering Matthew Henry's preaching and later views.

The necessity for secrecy, arising out of the persecutions of the times, which caused his ordination, as we have seen, to have been strictly private, also prevented the ordaining ministers giving him the usual certificate; and he simply received this brief testimonial under their hand:

“We whose names are subscribed, are well assured that Mr. Matthew Henry is an ordained minister of the gospel; sic testor.

WM. WICKENS,	NATH. VINCENT,
FRAN. TALLENTS,	JAMES OWEN,
EDW. LAWRENCE,	RICH. STEELE.”

“May 9, 1687.”



It was only in 1702, when four of these six ministers had passed away, and Francis Tallents, of Shrewsbury, and James Owen, of Oswestry, I think, alone survived, that this testimonial received its true interpretation under their hands, setting forth that it was drawn up so short and general because of the times; but that the true intent and meaning of it was, that Matthew Henry, after due observance and performance of all matters usual on such occasions, was by the imposition of hands ordained and set apart to the work of the ministry by the ministers whose names appeared to said certificate.

(To be continued.)

### BISHOP LAW ON INSPIRATION.

SIR,

OPENING Bishop Law's "Considerations on the Theory of Religion" the other day, in consequence of your reference to him in your last No., I alighted on the following passage, which, as shewing the retrogradation of the Church during the last century on the point in question (for his work was written in 1745), is exceedingly admonitory:

"Perhaps our very reverence for these sacred writings misapplied, our too unguarded zeal to do them honour, and support their divine authority, against that church which substitutes another in its room, may have contributed to cast a cloud over the whole; which makes us afraid to look into them, and examine these, with the same freedom that we do, and find we must do, every other book which we desire to understand:—I mean the notion of an *absolute*, immediate *inspiration* of each part and period; even where the writers themselves, by the very manner of expressing themselves, most effectually disclaim it: which, beside the bad effects it may be supposed to have at present, when once it appears (as soon perhaps it may) to have no good foundation in these holy books, 'tis to be feared will produce a worse, by tending to discredit that *partial* one, whether of *guidance* and *superintendency* (if that can properly be called such), or of *suggestion*, which upon some occasions they do claim, which is absolutely requisite to secure a due authority to them; and which, when prudently distinguished from the other, has, and we trust ever will appear to have, sufficient ground to support itself." (Ed. 5, p. 264.)

The liberty allowed by the Church in *his* day contrasts as strongly with the spirit opposed to it *now*, as the Bishop's enlightened views of Scripture (which in truth were the fruit of that liberty) do with the opposite views now so generally expressed.

Your extract in the last No. shews at least how truth and liberty were connected in his own mind; a connection worthy to have been recorded, as it was, on the monument erected to his memory. As you have supplied a translation of the inscription, some of your readers may like to see the original. An hour at Carlisle will at any time enable the traveller to read it for himself. The monument is affixed to a pillar in a side aisle of the cathedral choir. In the upper part is a recumbent figure at the foot of a cross, in the lower part the inscription, as follows,

the expression and succinctness of which it is difficult to preserve in an English dress. It is given, I find, in the short Memoir of his Life prefixed to the little reprint of his "Reflections on the Life and Character of Christ; with an Essay on the Nature and End of Death under the Christian Covenant," p. xxviii. Paley, I believe, wrote the epitaph; he himself was interred near the same spot, where a mere record marks his grave.

Columnæ hujus sepultus est ad pedem  
EDMUNDUS LAW, S.T.P.  
per xix fere annos hujus Ecclesiæ Episcopus.  
In evangelicâ veritate exquirendâ  
et vindicandâ  
ad extremam usque senectutem  
operam navavit indefessam.  
Quo autem studio et affectu veritatem  
Eodem et libertatem Christianam coluit,  
Religionem simplicem et incorruptam  
nisi salvâ libertate  
Stare non posse arbitratus.  
Obiit. Aug. xiv. MDCCLXXXVII.  
ÆTAT. lxxxiv.

May 7, 1863.

J. H. RYLAND.

#### THE WORD "ATONEMENT."

SIR,

You might have added to your list of quotations in illustration of the original use of the word "atonement," one from another author of high authority for the purity and correctness of his style.

Clarendon (History of the Rebellion, Oxford, 1826, Vol. I. p. 220), speaking of the pacification with the Scots in 1630, says: "The mischief that befell the King from this wonderful atonement cannot be expressed."

Birmingham, May 4, 1863.

JAS. RUSSELL.

#### MOSES AND AARON.

IN all outward appearance,—as the chief of the tribe of Levi, as the head of the family of Amram, as the spokesman and interpreter, as the first who "spake to the people and to Pharaoh all the words which the Lord had spoken to Moses," and did the signs in the sight of the people, as the permanent inheritor of the sacred staff or rod, the emblem of rule and power,—Aaron, not Moses, must have been the representative and leader of Israel. But Moses was the inspiring, informing soul within and behind; and, as time rolled on, as the first outward impression passed away and the deep abiding recollection of the whole story remained, Aaron, the prince and priest, has almost disappeared from the view of history; and Moses, the dumb, backward, disinterested prophet, continues for all ages the foremost leader of the chosen people, the witness that something more is needed for the guidance of man than high hereditary office or the gift of fluent speech,—a rebuke alike to an age that puts its trust in priests and nobles, and an age that puts its trust in preachers and speakers.—*Stanley's Jewish Church.*

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*The History of the Supernatural in all Ages and Nations, and in all Churches, Christian and Pagan: demonstrating a Universal Faith.* By William Howitt. In Two Volumes. Longman and Co. 1863.

WE have looked through these volumes with a painful feeling—one of pity for the author who could pen and publish nearly a thousand pages of such dreary nonsense. It is an attempt to get for spirit-rapping and the *philosophy, religion*, or whatever it may be rightly designated, of which *mediums* are the agents, a position, by making them links in a long chain of supernatural influences and events in the world's history. Such being the author's object, he has huddled together with little order or method all the strange, mysterious and incredible narratives of ancient and modern times which his reading or his experience has supplied. No attempt is made to weigh evidence or to corroborate his stories of supernatural agency. The more strange and incredible the stories are, the better they serve his end. It would be a manifest waste of time to criticise in detail such a book. There was a time, we believe, when Mr. Howitt was not careful to conceal his dissent from much contained in the orthodox creed. He now accepts willingly all its mysteries, and seems to be of the mind attributed to the late Lord Eldon, who, to express the loyalty of his unhesitating orthodoxy, regretted that the doctrines and articles prescribed for acceptance by the Church established by law did not draw more largely on his prompt and illimitable powers of faith. Whether Dr. Campbell (of the British Banner), Mr. Beecher, the Bishop of London, and other orthodox personages whom Mr. Howitt puts into the witness-box in behalf of the new spiritualism, will be pleased to find themselves in alliance with him, or will feel any gratitude for the testimony he bears in aid of orthodoxy, is another question. All we can say upon the subject is, that we shall not trouble ourselves to refute the new arguments brought forward under the inspiration of the spiritualist philosophy.

A specimen of Mr. Howitt's arguments, and especially of his use of Scripture, will serve to shew to what strange purposes the Bible may be put by those who, listening to the sound of its words, take no pains to reach its sense. After referring to some of the miracles recorded in the New Testament, which he considers as types of some "modern spiritualistic phenomena," he thus proceeds:

"However vastly inferior in degree to these great miracles are the modern ones of tables, chairs, and other material bodies being lifted into the air, and living persons borne through the air on such bodies, or floated of themselves, as they have been witnessed both in this country and in America by a number of people now living; yet they have raised a storm of denial, ridicule, and scorn in the so-called philosophic, as opposed to all belief, because they are said to violate the fixed laws of the universe. Those who deny these modern marvels, must, in their hearts, deny the relation of similar but greater things in the Bible, and the Rev. Mr. Beecher has reminded them that such denials sweep their way thoroughly through the sacred records. To those, however, who have seen and therefore believe these modern cases, the belief in the miracles of the Bible becomes a matter of course, and thus Christianity receives a new confirmation; and one amongst many answers is given to the question of *cui bono*?



"Here, again, the Roman Catholic reminds us how far Protestantism has retrograded in vital faith since its severance from that Church. Catholicism has always maintained the continuance of this miraculous power. It were easy to cite from the lives of their saints numbers of cases, where they, in their devotions, were raised from the ground; amongst them are Dominic and Loyola. Several of the female saints, as St. Theresa. Such cases are said to occur now, not unfrequently, by the Catholics. A lady of literary reputation of that Church, asserts herself to be frequently raised from the ground during her prayers; and we know a young Protestant lady who ceased to attend a certain church from feeling herself repeatedly lifted up, and fearing to make a spectacle of herself.

"There are many incidents and expressions in the New Testament on which modern phenomena throw a new and curious light. The knockings of spirits have been a subject of excessive ridicule amongst the *soi-disant* wits of this age, regardless of the fact, that the Majesty of heaven lying in a manger on earth, is to a mere natural mind an infinitely more ludicrous idea. But Christ, the Prince of spirits, uses this expression repeatedly, that He will stand and knock. He warns His followers to be alert on the watch for such knockings, telling them that they are sure to come, and in an hour when they do not expect it. 'Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord when he shall return from the wedding, that when he cometh and knocketh ye may open unto him. Blessed are those servants whom he shall find watching,' &c. It may be thought almost irreverent by many to name our Saviour in connection with spirit-knockings; but He tells us plainly that He will not only come and knock, but in Revelations, that He *stands knocking*; and He here adds, that He will not only knock, but He will gird Himself, and make His disciples sit down at table, and He will wait on them as a servant (Luke xii. 35—37). He is not too humble to knock and to stand knocking, but He will act the servitor of His humblest followers. He tells us not only that He will knock, but that we are to knock, and that it shall be opened to us. He promises still more. 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock, and if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne' (Revelations iii. 20, 21). Now if Christ does not disdain to knock at the door of our hearts, and to enter as we open, and wait on us at table, is it any condescension for His ministering spirits to knock on our walls, or doors, or tables, as well as in our hearts, to arouse us from the deathly trance of materialism? If knocking at our hearts and consciences will not do, is it at all improbable or ludicrous that they should proceed to knock still more earnestly and palpably on material substances as the only mediums for reaching our torpid and materialised senses? In so doing they are but imitating their Divine Master," &c. &c.—I. 199—201.

Mr. Howitt candidly admits that spiritualism has its dangers and difficulties. "If good spirits knock, evil spirits will come and knock too, and *have done it often enough*." So we have heard from some of the disciples of spiritualism, who, when deluded into some gross blunder or folly by supposed knockings or other spiritual manifestations, throw the blame on some mischief-working spirit in the invisible world. Lord Byron we have heard named as profoundly given to practical jokes which have embarrassed the new sect of KNOCKERS. He is apparently the *bete noir* of the spiritual world. But as it is admitted that evil spirits as well as good knock, and by knocking delude, it is practical wisdom not to open the door until you have some unerring rule given for ascertaining whether it be an angel of light or of darkness that asks to be admitted.

Some thirty years ago, Mr. Howitt appeared before the world as the historian of *Priestcraft*. He then with an unmistakeable will laid the scourge on spiritual despots of every name. It was then his aim to shew "that priestcraft in all ages and all nations has been the same; that its nature is one, and that nature essentially evil; that its object is self-gratification and self-aggrandisement; the means it uses the basest frauds, the most shameful delusions, practised on the popular mind." The craft which he sought to expose, he further told us, had locked up the human mind in the dens of ignorance, mocked it with imbecile legends, and by its childish puerilities and its ludicrous dogmas had evoked the spirit of atheism. And now that Mr. Howitt has become the hierophant of a new sect whose dogmas and puerilities and legends surpass in folly anything the world has ever before heard of, the craftsmen who formerly suffered from his lash may point to him as the latest illustration of the *Nemesis of Faith*.

When we formerly reviewed Mr. Howitt's book on *Priestcraft*, we felt it to be necessary to speak of his want of accuracy of statement, and of his acceptance of arguments and allegations without due regard to their authenticity and truth. This bad habit—bad in a moral as well as in a literary point of view—seems to have grown upon him; for a more carelessly constructed book both in style and statement has never passed through our hands.

As in his former work, so in this, Mr. Howitt professes to write the history of his subject "in all ages and nations." To do this an author must have an amount of scholarship such as few men possess. Of the possession of this Mr. Howitt has not given the public proof.

Mr. Howitt gives in his first volume the account of the table-turning practised in the reign of the emperor Valens. The narrative of this was communicated to the public by a learned correspondent (whose initials, J. J. T., disclose to most of our readers his name) in our pages (May, 1856). That this was the source of Mr. Howitt's knowledge on the subject, there is abundant internal evidence. The translation of the passage has received at Mr. Howitt's hands some alterations, some of them manifestly not improvements. But, by a curious error, he has quoted a portion of our correspondent's narrative, and given it as part of the translation of the passage of Ammianus Marcellinus (Vol. I. 366, l. 5—11). Mr. Howitt should have acknowledged the source of his information.

One of the arguments which Mr. Howitt uses to recommend his spiritual philosophy is, that it succeeds where other remedies have failed in curing infidelity. On the authority of Professor Hare, he states that in America alone 25,000 persons have been converted by it from deism and atheism to Christianity. In America, he alleges, there are no less than 2,500,000, "at a moderate estimate," who profess to have arrived at their convictions of spiritual communication from personal experience. The last distinguished convert whom he names is Mr. Channing, of Boston. The Mormons are quoted as illustrations of the power of spiritualism. Mr. Howitt, though admitting the admixture of error and folly in Mormonism, attributes to it "genuine and gospel truth." For any and every system and sect that have developed credulity and fanaticism, our author has a large charity; but for writers like Middleton, Douglas and Farmer, who have been careful to apply the tests of reason

and rigid scrutiny to supernatural narratives, he intimates not simply dislike, but hints his doubt of their sincerity. What system of faith he would commend to the acceptance of his readers, we shall not stop to imagine; but he himself makes no concealment of his antipathy to the genius of Protestantism. These are his words—strange words to come from one who in much of his former life and effort has shewn his sympathy with all those grand results of liberty, truth and happiness, which Protestantism promotes, but against which Popery wages an unsparing warfare:

“In fact, the present state of Protestantism, opposed as it is to the whole history of man, and to the plainest and most precious promises of the Gospel, being out of nature, must of necessity have an end; for

What though the written word be born no more,  
The spirit revelation still proceeds,  
Evolving all perfection.

It is high time, therefore, to protest against all Protestantism, and to come back to the Gospel in its unclipped fulness and life.”—II. 167.

On the same grounds the protest should be extended against education, especially against the training of the reasoning faculties.

The work before us is not without its use. It is so boldly bad, that it may help to teach, by a negative example, the use and necessity of exercising our reason before we give our faith; and that in religion, as in the affairs of daily life, common sense is a safe guide. In respect to the claims of spiritualism to acceptance, we may surely be permitted to think and say, that until some cases, credibly attested, can be produced in which its phenomena have tended to some practical good, it will not be treated with respect by thoughtful persons. If all the tables in all the brokers' shops in London rise and take their flight to the ceiling, they will still say, *Cui bono?* whom does it benefit? If the mysteries of clairvoyance can reveal to our merchants and statesmen something in futurity that baffles their wisdom, such as when the American war will end, or what will be the value of Consols on the 1st of January, 1864, spiritualism will have converts and disciples enough and to spare.

---

*The Truthseeker: a Review of Literature and Events relating to the Development of Religious Life and Liberty in the Christian Church.* Edited by the Rev. John Page Hopps. No. I., May, 1863.

MR. HOPPS, it is well known, is beneficially exerting himself in a new society at Sheffield. The swarming populations of our large towns require many such workers. Among other means of usefulness, we perceive he has now commenced, we presume, a *monthly* publication, entitled the *Truthseeker*, as above. The promise given is of a review “catholic in spirit, unsectarian in aim, and accessible to all; containing from time to time, in addition to its reviews, original articles on ecclesiastical history and biography, ancient forms of Christian faith, modern Church life and organization, the differences and agreements of the various sections of the Christian Church, and the text of the New Testament, with explanations of difficult passages and inexact translations; thus giving a permanent interest to its labours.”

We heartily wish Mr. Hopps a large amount of usefulness and success. The subjects discussed in his first No. are, in addition to a statement of the objects of the work,—1, on “the Revelation of a Living God;”



2, "Who are the True Friends of the Bible?" 3, "The Bishops and Dr. Colenso;" 4, "The Romantic Prosecution of Professor Jowett;" 5 and 6, notices of sermons by Mr. Marshall and Mr. W. G. Clark; and 7, an explanation of Rom. ix. 3. If the subjects lack variety, they are chiefly devoted to matters of great present interest. The discussion is designedly carried on altogether in a popular style. A correspondent desires in our pages an opportunity of putting in a word or two of caution, suggested to his mind after the perusal of this No. of the "Truthseeker." As the sole object of our much-esteemed friend and coadjutor Mr. Hopps is truth, we feel assured he will accept the cautions in the really friendly spirit and pure love of truth in which they are offered.

The presentation of truth to the people in a form adapted to their appreciation is a most desirable yet sometimes a difficult object. We do not like to use the term popularization. It so often means a missing of truth in the paramount aim of gaining an audience. It requires qualities of the highest order. Nothing is more true than that it requires the greatest proficient to write the most elementary treatise. We do not employ these words in the least degree to depreciate Mr. Hopps. His readers are quite aware of his excellences, which they will find in more than one article of the work before us. We wish, however, to point out one or two things that have struck us in reading his first No.

In an additional Lecture for the People, p. 9, he appears to us to put the case of "Sun, stand thou still," &c., and of Balaam, upon a wrong issue,—an issue which would be good against all miracle whatsoever. If it means God's power over nature, that power must be as competent to the mightiest as to the humblest effect; nay, both are the same. If what we term a law be subject to a lawgiver, it matters not in what it obeys his will.\* Of course, it were possible and easy to account for these and some other cases without the intervention of miracle; but to object to them on the ground of incredibility or impossibility is not the correct issue. It is true Mr. Hopps adduces them as arguments against the inspiration of the narrative; still the issue of his statement must be granted, to have any effect for his argument. To that issue it is we object. A better and juster statement would have been that, if true, there needed no inspiration to tell or record them; and that, if not actually occurring, they are otherwise accounted for.

Again, at p. 5, more directly on the subject of inspiration, he says:

"How can we think that words, however wise, can reveal God as acts and living deeds can do? How can we turn from the living, breathing witness, here before our eyes or in our souls, fresh from the hand of the Heavenly Architect, and think to find all we are to know of Him in words imperfectly saved from the ruins of the past, and then only conveying, through doubtful processes of change and translation, such hints of the first thought of the writer as may now survive? How can we bear to shut up the living God between the pages of a book, however precious, and content ourselves with fancying that He cannot come to our hearts as He came to the hearts of men in ancient times?"

---

\* Pope says: "Atoms or systems into ruin hurled,  
And now a bubble burst and now a world."

But this need not be, even in the suspension of their law (and it is the same law in the greater and the smaller instance), if God has power over law, which we suppose every believer in Him must allow.

We very much object to this statement, and fear its effect will be precisely that which Mr. Hopps himself deprecates, viz. to shut up the living God between the pages of the Bible; make it, in fact, a closed book so far as *distinctive superiority of inspiration* is concerned.

First, what are "words" but the expression of the action of the soul? And its acts through them may reveal God more than anything else; as emanations of soul they are themselves "acts and living deeds."\* Then as to his contrast of "the witness before our eyes or in our souls," to "words imperfectly saved from the ruins of the past," does he not see that such words are the expression of a *once* living soul, and that the only question is, *whether such souls as express themselves in Scripture* (for it is of *its* words he speaks) *had inspiration higher and deeper than ours, and what was its cause?* Granted "we do not think to find *all* we know of God in Scripture," we are nevertheless quite sure we find the best and most we know of Him in it; infinitely higher than elsewhere; and therefore, comparatively speaking, even *all*; especially when we recollect how its inspiration, or rather the inspiration of its holy men and prophets, have fed and sustained the world in its present truth. Though "a storm-tossed book," the waves have borne it up, like One of whom it tells, and its "messages," though "of the past," will *not* be exceeded in the future. Nor do we expect to see another "well of life" like that which that One opened.

Mr. Hopps may not intend to depreciate the distinctive superiority of the religious convictions and inspirations of the characters recorded in Scripture, but it is the inevitable effect of the way in which he writes. We give the passage just glanced at entire:

"Was Moses inspired by the living God, and David, and Isaiah, and Christ, and Paul? Did they speak to the ages as God counselled them and as men were able to bear it, and can we even *imagine* that God has nothing more to say to men, except to repeat, through the medium of a storm-tossed book, the messages of the past? Have we a living God, and has He for us no living message? What well of life was opened in the ancient days that is now closed? What voice found its way into the anxious heart that now has died away? What has happened to these latter days that the way from heaven to earth should be closed,—that God should turn away and speak no more as He once did to His longing children, who sorely need Him now in these distracted times?"

This passage, it is evident upon the face of it, places the experience of the great personages of the Jewish and Christian revelation,—nay, of Christ himself,—on the same level with our now ordinary human experience; or, which is the same thing, pleads for ours being equal to theirs. This is a mistake. It is one thing to attempt to lift us up through their inspiration to their own exceeding height, but it is quite another to suppose that we have it already in ourselves. Now this is the crying and exceeding danger of our popular and other efforts at the present time; and unless strongly and fearlessly resisted by the deeper and more enlightened Christian convictions of calmer judging men amongst us, will most certainly end in our utter loss of anything of distinctive revelation at all, and as inevitably to be followed in time by decline in the strength and purity of moral life.

It is a tendency which it behoves the friends of a positive superhuman

---

\* "Thoughts that breathe and words that burn."

element in the Jewish and Christian revelations most strenuously to resist. Not for a moment must we attempt to gain the multitude either in lower or higher life by such efforts and such professions. It arises now from earnest activities in the new openings taking place around us for gaining numbers to our faith, as it is called. But this is *not* our faith. There may be great numbers of non-believing men, there may be as many broken away by reaction from orthodox communities; but we are not for a moment to concede a particle of the divine truth we have received to gain even *them*: we have to gain, exalt, inspire them with the same; we only betray our ignorance of the faith, our want of thought and study, our inability to discern the truth of history, the relations of fact to feeling, the certainties of evidence and divine effects on the human heart, if we think to gain into the church of the future believers or non-believers, we know not which, by overlooking the infinite value of the revelations which once came to man, and which, once lost, undervalued and reduced to a common level of humanity, we shall as naturally and certainly sink into the horrors of heathenism, as men have everywhere done without and before a special revelation of God.

We speak on a broad and general scale, and far beyond the limits of what has suggested our remarks. But broad and general results are the formation of lesser wide-spread causes. And we cannot but be aware that many such now exist. We are quite sure that Mr. Hopps, when speaking in the publication before us of past and present revelations from God, is as far as possible from fearing any such result. His whole aim, we know, is the opposite direction. We wish only, in noticing his new work, to guard him against the issues on which his positions, accurately weighed, clearly place the momentous subject. Nor do we do so merely in reference to him. Many others place the subject on exactly the same footing—among *us*, too, who have long had the glory of supplying the best defenders of our common Christianity. The cause, no doubt, is to be found, as already hinted, in the demand and consequent supply of *practical* religion: very good and very just—but once separated from its deeper and special root, it will turn but to our own poor selves after all. The danger then must be met, or we shall be insensibly landed in the regions of speculative unbelief; unbelief, that is, in anything above the ordinary in the great Revelation we inherit. The dangers, indeed, of hasty, ill-considered views in the present time of quick movement, idolizing of success, expectation that Unitarians have little else to do than to gather in the harvest of the church, are all-prevailing. If we continue to be dazzled by the prospect of immediate results, blind to the necessity of patience and knowledge, receptive with open arms of all comers, regardless of fitting ourselves for the proper appreciation of the Christian revelation, we shall assuredly cease to have any weight or respect in the Christian world, we shall cease among the churches to be, as hitherto, distinguished above others when the common faith is in peril (for which paramount purpose, be it remembered, our honourable prestige of liberty is alone valuable), and our place will be filled by more worthy, devoted and patient investigators and holders of the truth. We write it in sober sadness, apart from all individual references and considerations whatsoever.



## OBITUARY.

### THE REV. WILLIAM BIRKS.

In the small and scattered village of Flagg, situated in the secluded and wild district of the Derbyshire Peak, died on Jan. 23, 1863, the Rev. WILLIAM BIRKS, one of the ministers of the North-Midland Mission Society, aged 58 years. It is not right that the course of this faithful labourer in a humble but interesting department of our Lord's vineyard, should terminate without some further notice in the pages of the Christian Reformer.

Mr. Birks was born in the parish of Ashover, Derbyshire, Dec. 1st, 1805. In infancy he was removed with his parents to Dicklant, where he was brought up, and where he received the first rudiments of his education under the pious care of an aunt. He was accustomed to say that in the Wesleyan Sunday-school, of which he was a regular attendant, his religious impressions were greatly strengthened and matured. In this school he was afterwards himself a teacher for several years. In regard to his general education, the only assistance he had was obtained in the township school, of which he was for a considerable period a free scholar. But after he left school he was an ardent and diligent student, and pursued self-culture with remarkable success, as his varied and solid attainments proved.

The discipline of the Wesleyan body had a large share in forming his religious character and fixing his religious habits. At the age of eighteen he was a regular attendant at a class-meeting, and received his first ticket as a recognized member of the church. Afterwards he became a class-leader, and then a local preacher of great acceptance and success in the Cromford district. His occupation at this time was that of a schoolmaster; and so good was his repute as a teacher, that in 1831 he was appointed to the mastership of the Stony Middleton public school. Here he resided for many years, pursuing his vocation and filling various offices of public trust and usefulness to which he was called by the voice of his friends and neighbours. During the whole of this time, in addition to all his other duties, he diligently pursued, as a labour of love, the work of a local preacher, taking his turn at various chapels in the district where he lived.

The change that took place in his religious opinions was very gradual; and he had begun to preach the positive doctrines of Unitarianism before he was aware of the existence of a body of Christians hold-

ing the views to which he had been brought by his own religious meditations and independent study of the Scriptures. Great was his joy when he met with others like-minded with himself, and found that he could join a Christian community holding doctrines which he had learned to prize very highly, as more consonant with the teachings of the Saviour, and better fitted to meet the spiritual needs of man, than those in which he had been educated.

In the year 1856, he was appointed to the Unitarian ministry in the Peak district, residing at Hucklow, but preaching principally at Flagg. In the following year he removed to the latter place, where he continued to reside up to the time when, after a short and severe illness, he was summoned by death from his work on earth. How much he was beloved in the district in which he was so well known, and how greatly his loss is there felt, was manifest by the large attendance and the sorrowful demeanour of old and young at his funeral, and on the following Sunday at the chapel, when an attempt was made to improve the event. Long, we feel assured, will the memory of this good and faithful country pastor be cherished by his flock. The resting-place of his mortal remains in the chapel-yard will be visible to them from Sunday to Sunday as they go to their worship; and as they think with reverent affection of his virtues and his counsels, the sight and the recollection will be well calculated to lift their hearts from the grave to God, and from earth to heaven.

### THE LATE MR. SCOTT, OF GIRVAN.

Mr. MATTHEW SCOTT was a native of Girvan, in Ayrshire. His parents were strict Calvinists, and they brought their son up in the same religious principles. He was educated in the parish school, and when he left it was considered a good Latin scholar, and was not without mathematical acquirements. His father was a hosier, and he was put to the same business. About thirty years ago, while working in a small village called Patna, he became acquainted with Mr. Alexander Galbreath, a decided Unitarian, who was a singularly shrewd and talented man, and had considerable influence in leading Mr. Scott to the examination of liberal views of Christianity. At this period he was favoured with the loan of a discourse, by the late Dr. Southwood Smith, on "The Incompatibility of the Doctrine of the Trinity with that of the Divine Unity." Often

did he say that this discourse made him a Unitarian. On returning home, he freely conversed on his new ideas, and in a little time gathered around him a few working men disposed to embrace more rational views of Bible teaching than those generally held. His earliest friend and most intimate companion was smitten with the heresy. This gentleman was the teacher of the charity school in Girvan, and paid the penalty of expulsion for his mental honesty. He still lives, and is an honour to the small society to which Mr. Scott ministered. To crush the rising heresy at this time, the Rev. Mr. Duncan, U.P., delivered some violent denunciatory discourses against what he called "Socinianism." The circumstances becoming known to the late Rev. George Harris, he took a lively interest in the matter, and went to Girvan and preached upon the leading doctrines of Unitarianism. By the energy of Mr. Scott, a small congregation was formed, which met in a private house and sometimes in a beaming shop. At this crisis they applied for the Town Hall for Mr. Harris to preach in. The Town Council denied it, though it was let for all kinds of popular amusements. This intolerance induced Mr. Scott to appeal to the Unitarians of Great Britain and Ireland for aid to build a place of worship for themselves. The appeal was kindly responded to, and soon the subscriptions enabled the society to go on with its plans. The chapel was built in 1850, and opened in May, 1851, by the Rev. George Harris. The orthodox clergy became alarmed. A meeting of the ministers of the town and neighbourhood was held, and it was agreed that they should make a united attack on the faith of the infant church. The Rev. Mr. Easton, minister of the Reformed Presbyterian church, opened the campaign with a violent onslaught upon the young church. Mr. Scott stood firm in the defence of his new faith. He replied to the first attack in a small pamphlet, which was so ably written that the people of Girvan were taken by surprise and ascribed it to Mr. Harris. Mr. Scott, however, attended the whole of Mr. Easton's lectures, and promptly replied to each as it was delivered, with remarkable scriptural knowledge and power. The spirit of intolerance was entirely conquered by Mr. Scott's known character for steadiness and intelligence; and as a remarkable proof of this, he was chosen unanimously by the parochial board inspector of the poor. In this public situation, which he held for several years, he gained the esteem and confidence of all parties, and discharged its duties in a most exemplary manner. His opinion was often

sought on difficult cases of poor-law matters, both by lawyers and inspectors. A series of papers on pauperism in Girvan appeared some time ago in the *Ayrshire Observer*, which proved him to be a man of no common ability. He fell a sacrifice to his deep sense of duty. Visiting the lowest hovels of poverty and disease, he caught fever, which was raging in the town, and was at once struck down. When his death was announced, it threw a shadow of gloom and sorrow over the whole place. A large and respectable company followed his remains to the grave, and all the clergy of the town, with one exception, honoured both themselves and his memory by their presence. The Rev. Mr. Crosskey, from Glasgow, officiated on the occasion.

Mr. Scott was a man of an amiable and benevolent disposition, modest and retiring in his general habits, full of zeal in all matters pertaining to the well-being of man and the cause of true religion. His life furnishes a noble and striking proof of the power of high character to live down even the extreme bigotry of Scotland. From Sunday to Sunday, Mr. Scott faithfully conducted the services of the Unitarian church; and by his simple and modest integrity, his deep and unobtrusive piety, his wise judgment and kindness of heart, won the respect and regard of every member of the community in which he lived.

---

March 22, ANNA LÆTTITIA, infant daughter of the Rev. Alfred W. WORTHINGTON, of Mansfield.

---

March 24, at Ilminster, HANNAH MARIA COLLINS, daughter of the late John Collins, Esq., of Horton, and niece of the late Dr. Blake, of Taunton, aged 51 years.

Connected with the Unitarian congregation of the town from her infancy, she made it evident in her own unstudied way that its interests were always near her heart. In the support of its connected institutions she always did her part, and, when health permitted, failed not to be in her place at the accustomed times of social worship. She was of the number of those who do not care to bring their own virtues ostensibly to light, so that the reality was superior to the seeming. She was possessed of much goodness of heart, and there are those who can tell of her acts of kindness now that she has passed away from them and can be kind no more upon earth. She was animated by a strong sense of the right, by high principles of truth and rectitude, and she looked with honest indignation upon wrong-doing and the wrong-doer. To all hypocrisy, to all



infidelity in religious matters, she was an uncompromising, but not an uncharitable, enemy; and she felt it both her duty and her joy to maintain her own religious convictions without regarding their unpopularity or the bitter words which were sometimes said against them.

The trials of life fell to the lot of this lady as the general rule of Providence. She had her trials, and if they were few in the opening years of life, they were far less easy to be borne in the closing ones. But they were borne with a Christian spirit. They did not find expression in fretfulness and discontent and murmur; they were submitted to as a part of the dispensation which it were impiety to suspect of harshness or deficient of infinite wisdom and benevolence.

"Our late fellow-worshiper," said her friend and minister, "had many virtues, and these, as well as her resignation, which was indeed one of them, manifested the power of Christ's religion over the life. I need not say that her religious views and convictions were such as fully approve themselves to our minds. Worshiping with us as she did from childhood, the fact needs no words to make it expressive. These religious views and convictions did not fail her when the strongest possible test was applied to their value. She found them sufficient for her need when that need was the greatest. Having striven in life to be true to Christianity, she found to the last that Christianity was true to her. She saw in the *lifting up of the Lord* the grand lesson of life, the all-assuring pledge of immortality. She felt the inspiration of his words. She was drawn to him and after him towards the unseen state where his presence is a glory and bliss to many. She hoped that through the Divine mercy she might be permitted to follow him thither; and in that hope she died."

That hope tells us that if there be a space vacant in the family and in the congregation, there is one more occupied in the city "whose builder and maker is God."

March 24, at London Fields, Hackney, in the 88th year of her age, ANN, the widow of the late Mr. John CLENNELL.

March 26, in her 80th year, at Broom Hall, near Sheffield, ELIZABETH, widow of Nathaniel PHILIPPS, D.D., who for upwards of thirty years was the eloquent and respected minister of the Upper chapel in that town. Mrs. Philipps was the youngest daughter of the late Thomas Harmer, Esq., of Ipswich, and inherited that bene-

volence of character for which he was distinguished. Few have passed through a long life more associated with the esteem and affection of a large circle of acquaintance, or who have been more endeared by an amiability of disposition and kindness of heart.

March 31, at Pine-Villa Park, Cheltenham, SARAH LAWSON, wife of J. B. Lawson, Esq., and sister of R. Kershaw Lumb, Esq. Her unexpected death leaves a painful void in the circle which she adorned by her gentle and cheerful goodness.

April 4, at Hill House, Derby, Mrs. MARY WRIGHT, aged 65 years.

April 5, at 31, Chester Terrace, Regent's Park, JOHN TAYLOR, Esq., F.R.S., in his 84th year. He was (says the *Gentleman's Magazine*) a native of Norwich, and the eldest brother of the late Gresham Professor of Music. He left Norwich at an early age, and was actively and largely engaged, until a recent period, as a civil engineer in mining operations. Mr. Taylor was one of the very early members of the Geological Society, and afterwards its Treasurer. He was an honorary member of many foreign scientific bodies, and one of the founders of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and its Treasurer until 1862.

April 20, at Edge Lane, Liverpool, aged 70 years, ANNE BANCROFT, wife of Samuel THORNELY, Esq.

April 23, at Whitby, ELIZABETH, the beloved wife of Rev. John OWEN, minister of the Flowergate chapel in that town. The burial took place in the ground of Lydgate chapel, a district which had been the scene for many years of her benevolence and usefulness. In the funeral sermon at Whitby, Rev. J. H. Ryland, the preacher, dwelt upon the gentleness, kindness, quick sympathy and earnest benevolence which were traits in her character—upon her usefulness and unwearied devotion in every relation of life—and the patience and resignation with which she bore the painfully lingering illness by which that life was closed.

May 4, at the Limes, Old Dover Road, Canterbury, THOMAS LEVER BURCH, Esq., in the 76th year of his age.

May 13, at Beech Cottage, Warren Point, Rev. JAMES LUNN, Presbyterian minister of Carlingford for the last forty-two years, in the 89th year of his age.